DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 201 344 JC 810 133

AUTHOR Stone, James C.: And Others
TITLE An Evaluation Report of the Writing and Reading Labs at Ohlone College.
INSTITUTION Ohlone Coll., Fremont, Calif.
PUB DATE 1 May 80
NOTE 93p.: Sections of Appendix B contained copyrighted material and are therefore not available.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Educational Media; Instructional Materials; Program Evaluation; *Reading Centers; *Remedial Programs; *Remedial Reading; Student Attitudes; Student Placement; Teacher Attitudes; Textbook Evaluation; Tutorial Programs; Two Year Colleges; *Writing Instruction
IDENTIFIERS *Writing Laboratories

ABSTRACT

Methodology and findings are reported for a study of the materials and instructional components of the Reading and Writing Laboratories at Ohlone College conducted by a team of five external evaluators. The report's first section details: (1) the goals of both labs, as articulated by the college; (2) specific objectives of the study; i.e., to evaluate diagnostic procedures, personnel effectiveness, the integration of English classroom instruction with writing lab materials, faculty and student attitudes towards the labs, and the extent to which objectives were being met; and (3) the study methodology, which involved interviews with students and faculty, as well as an examination of lab materials and procedures. The next sections of the report summarize findings for the writing lab (Section II) and reading lab (Section III). Each section evaluates the physical setting of the lab; the methods used to refer students to the lab and to place them in the sequence of lab courses; the instructional materials used; the particular strengths and weaknesses of the lab; procedures followed by students in the lab; tutorial services; and the evaluator's, faculty's, staff's, and student's reactions to the lab. In addition, Section II evaluates classroom instruction by the English department faculty. Finally, Section IV summarizes the study's findings and presents accompanying recommendations for improvement. (JP)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED201344

AN EVALUATION REPORT

OF

THE WRITING AND READING LABS

AT

OHLONE COLLEGE

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

James C. Stone

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

X Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

By

Evaluation Team:

James C. Stone, UC, Berkeley, Chairman
Sandy Booher, Los Medanos College
Gordon Cox, UC, Berkeley
Thom Hawkins, UC, Berkeley
Mike McHargue, Foothill College

May 1, 1980

TC 810 133

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO

SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA 94720

May 14, 1980

Hector Córdova
Area Dean, The Arts
Ohlone College
P.O. Box 3909
Fremont, CA 94538

Dear Dean Córdova:

I am pleased to transmit to you herewith the report of the evaluative research team responsible for investigating and assessing the effectiveness of the Reading and Writing Programs at Ohlone College. The findings and recommendations were considered in such detail that they represent the conclusions of the total team.

The team is grateful to you and Cindy Katona for the effective liaison you provided, to the faculty of the English and Counseling departments, and to faculty and staff of the Reading and Writing Labs for their wholehearted cooperation.

On behalf of the evaluation team,

Yours sincerely,

James C. Stone, Chairman

JCS:js
Enclosure

Table of Contents

Section		Page
1.	Genesis of the Study	3
2.	The Teaching of Writing	8
3.	The Reading Lab	39
4.	Summary of Findings and Recommendations	64

Appendices:

A. Supplementary Notes on Writing Lab Materials

B. Articles for Further Consideration

Section 1. GENESIS OF THE STUDY

Ohlone Community College serves the Fremont/Newark area, an industrialized region with a significant third world population. In the 79-80 AY, the college has an approximate enrollment of 4000 equivalent full-time students, and a faculty of approximately 100 full-time and 300 part-time instructors. The student body consistsprimarily of white middle-class students. The third world students consist primarily of Blacks and Chicanos. The college has many Hearing-Impaired students enrolled, and has a special Hearing-Impaired curriculum. Ohlone College is located in a rural setting east of Fremont on a new campus that was completed in 1974. The facilities are beautifully designed and built; they are spacious, convivial, and ideally-suited for their purpose.

Philosophy:

Following a try-out period in the early '70's, Ohlone College established Reading and Writing Labs for all students when the new campus opened in 1974. The philosophy governing the Reading Lab follows:

> The Reading Lab was developed to provide Ohlone College students with the opportunity to develop on an individual basis, those reading and study skills which are the key to effective learning. As a result, the lab contains a wide variety of skill building materials for all levels of ability, remedial through advanced. The types of skills materials available in the lab program include: vocabulary, reading rate, comprehension, phonics, skimming, spelling, notetaking, listening and such specific study skills topics as improving concentration, test taking and memory improvement.
>
> The basic philosophy of the Reading Lab is that each student should have the opportunity to develop his learning skills to meet his individual needs. Each student is pretested when the quarter begins, assigned appropriate materials and proceeds through the material at his own rate. Each student is free to choose his own schedule of specific hours in the lab based on the "section" in which he is enrolled.

The statement of philosophy supporting the establishment and operation of the Writing Lab follows:

> The Writing Lab should handle a variety of student needs and student clients. The lab should offer service to all segments of the community: the vocational and technical student, the four year college transfer student, the adult (male or female) returning to school for further education, the remedial level person with no larger goal than attaining the basic skills of English. In brief, the Writing Lab must be capable of effectively serving all elements of the community.
>
> The lab must work towards this goal in a human and personal manner while remaining conscious of the limitations of such practical consideration as funding, staffing, physical facilities, etc. A truly effective program will maintain an appropriate balance between individual work and interaction with other students and the instructors; it will also maintain an appropriate balance between programmed materials, audio-visual materials, and person to person contact in one-to-one situations. The program will recognize that there is a very positive and valuable place for the non-professional; instructional assistants, trained tutors, and clerks. These non-professionals, of course, must work under the guidance of the trained English Instructor and are limited to specific types of duties and responsibilities. The program must be sufficiently flexible to assist the remedial student who needs a whole sequence of skill building activities as well as the advanced student who may need assistance on only one specific skill. Finally, a well functioning lab will use a variety of media to help each student achieve to the maximum of his ability in a non-threatening, self-paced, and supportive manner.
>
> The Writing Lab should avoid the stigma of being the place for the "bonehead" student. This can be overcome by recognizing that all levels of students are using the lab, by physically establishing the lab in the environment of a Learning Resource area, and by integrating the Writing Lab with other learning services for the student.

The Problem:

With the passage of time, the addition of new faculty, and the expansion of part-time faculty (numbering 13 in the English department, Spring, 1980), questions regarding the operation and effectiveness of the labs have been raised from time to time. These questions have been discussed repeatedly at various meetings of the English department. With increasing numbers of students attending the college who possess marked deficiencies in language and reading skills, the extent to which the labs were meeting

the individual needs of such a wide range of students, particularly minority students, was at issue. As one instructor put it, "The labs have been running for a long time and we've been band-aiding the lesions wherever they appeared."

In response to a faculty consensus that a need existed to study how best to improve the operation and effectiveness of the labs, the Assistant Dean of Instruction for the Arts proposed to the college administration that a formal evaluation be undertaken by a team external to the college. The proposal was accepted and funds were provided for the 1979-80 AY.

By prior agreement with the English department, the evaluation was performed by a team whose qualifications first were reviewed and approved by the faculty of the department. The team contracted by the college consisted of two reading and writing specialists from a major university and two from Bay Area community colleges, plus a chief evaluator. Three special meetings were held with the English department during the three months of study: an initial discussion of the purpose and design of the investigation, one mid-way into the Winter 1980 quarter to secure feedback on how the study was being perceived, and one at the conclusion of the evaluation to present findings and recommendations.

Purpose:

The overall purpose of the evaluation was to provide findings and recommendations to improve the materials and the instructional components of the Reading and Writing Labs. More specifically, the evaluation addressed the following questions:

1. How adequate are the labs' diagnostic procedures, prescriptive processes, and materials?
2. How effective are the personnel--instructors, supervisors, tutors--when working with students in the labs?
3. How well integrated is the English classroom instruction with the Writing Lab's instructional materials?
4. What are the Reading and Writing Labs' strengths and weaknesses as perceived by students, English department faculty, lab personnel, and the Counseling staff?

5. How effective are the labs in achieving their purposes as stated in their philosophies, and what suggestions and recommendations will improve them?

Design of the Study:

This was a formative evaluation. Two specialists concentrated on the Reading Lab, two on the Writing Lab, and the Chief Evaluator covered both. The specialists examined and assessed the published materials available in the labs, the operational procedures and processes, and the adequacy of the human and physical resources. Individual interviews were the primary data gathering method used. Triangulation was employed by conducting multiple interviews with the same individuals by three different interviewers, and by securing comparable data through interviews, questionnaires and participant observations. Every member of the English department was interviewed at least once. The Dean of Instruction and Assistant Dean of Instruction were interviewed. Also interviewed were samples of students, tutors, and all the lab personnel, both classified and certificated.

Members of the Counseling staff were interviewed as a group. Telephone interviews were conducted with five of the 13 part-time English instructors. All part-time instructors responded to a questionnaire asking about assets and liabilities of the Writing Lab. An anonymous questionnaire was distributed to regular students one day in the cafeteria, to all students in the EOPS program, and to part-time students enrolled in evening classes. The student questionnaire consisted of four forms, one each for those who were using and had used the Reading and Writing Labs. A fifth form was given to students who had not used the Reading Lab, in order to determine their reasons for not using it.

Finally, the evaluation team spent approximately five days each on campus observing the operation and use of the labs, informally conversing with students and lab staffs, and recording observations and impressions. The Chief Evaluator spent a publically-announced day at the college for any individual who wished to talk about the labs. In analyzing the data from the materials reviewed, interviews, questionnaires, and recorded observations, consensus

patterns were determined. The data that were corroborated from several perspectives and methodologies were determined to be facts, and are described as findings in the report. The findings served as the basis for the team's recommendations.

Criterion:

The basic criterion for this evaluation is the extent to which the Reading and Writing Labs are achieving the purposes for which they were established. Using this criterion, Section 2 of this report analyzes the data regarding the Writing Lab, Section 3 is devoted to the Reading Lab, and Section 4 contains a summary of the findings and recommendations of the study.

Section 2: THE TEACHING OF WRITING

Classroom Instruction by the English Department Faculty:

All courses in the writing program have clear skills objectives set fourth in specific course outlines. The program is built on a tiered approach, going from the word level, to the sentence level, and on to the paragraph, in three different quarter-length remedial courses that most students must take. Students may receive an A.A. degree after mastering the paragraph level, but if they wish to transfer, they must continue through the 1A and 1B sequence. All of the above courses have lab components which account for 25% of the student's grade. More specifically, the skills covered in the classroom are:

English 20--basic sentence structure and study skills for multicultural students with limited English background

English 21A-The Word--recognition of sentence parts and various types of verbs and prepositions

English 21B-The Sentence--completeness, standard grammar, usage, and punctuation

English 21C-The Paragraph--its structure and purpose

English 1A--The Essay

English 1B--The Research Paper

English 1C--Introduction to Literature

Student placement in these courses will be discussed further. (The majority of students at Ohlone enter at the 21A level.) In addition to the skills specified, each course in the 21 series and the 1A teach some reading, spelling, punctuation, and vocabulary. The material from the preceding course is to be reviewed, and a major objective is to prepare the student for the next course in the sequence.

No attempt was made to observe classroom instruction or to evaluate teacher preparedness, expertise, or adherence to the course outlines. It was assumed that the faculty are competent and responsible in their teaching, as that has never been at issue. There also seems to be no controversy about separating the remedial students from the 1A students, or separating the remedial students into three or four groups based on test scores and instructor discretion. So "tracking" is accepted as beneficial and necessary to the teaching process. Several instructors, however, expressed the fear that minority students, who are placed in the 21 series in high proportions, tend to get "turned off" because little effort is made toward cultural pluralism in the choice of materials or activities. Claims were made that students who come from the summer readiness program full of enthusiasm and self-confidence are met with a lack of understanding and a certain righteous intolerance from the English faculty, who may provide the student's first introduction to the college's regular program. Said one instructor, "The department needs to face this problem, but most people are too defensive to talk about it." Several instructors independently agreed that the minority drop rate is high. "The Chicanos quit completely, while the Black kids jump around from course to course, not finishing anything."

Another issue involves the interrelationship of lab and class. While the lab was created supposedly to remove the burden of teaching mechanics and drill from the classroom, many instructors in the 21 series limit their teaching to the same types of materials and concepts covered by the lab. One instructor expressed the theory that the true purpose of the lab is to keep part-time instructors from straying beyond the necessary mechanics and drill in class. Thus, while nearly everyone is happy with what goes on in the 1A and

1B classroom, there is a big issue concerning what kinds of writing practice students actually are getting in the 21 series classrooms. The question is whether students are learning enough about the process of writing to master it, or whether they are simply continuing the lab work of learning the labels that Engligh teachers hold dear: noun complement, reflexive pronoun, correlative conjunction and so on. As one instructor put it, "There's a big debate going on across the country about the usefulness of grammar instruction, but we don't debate it here. It's a given." Instructors who don't hold to the idea that people learn to write by concentrating on forms and terms have evolved a variety of coping mechanisms. Some avoid teaching the remedial courses. Some maintain that the average remedial writer is such a hard case that he can't learn how to write in a year, but at least he can learn the proper grammatical terms to understand his mistakes. Some maintain that writing as a skill can't be taught to anyone, period (the "you have it or you don't" theory). Some provide a rich variety of writing assignments in an effort to have students integrate what they are learning about mechanics with the act of composing. These instructors feel they are definitely in the minority. Said one, "Not much writing goes on in the 21 courses." What everyone seems to agree on is that, although the 1A student who comes out of the 21 series is competent in grammatical terminology and may have gotten A's all the way along, he doesn't usually write very confidently or very well. Some attribute this problem to the student, some to the program. A few instructors are bothered by this; most are not. "What else can you do?",one remarked.

Strengths and Weaknesses:

The strengths of the classroom instruction lie mainly in the consistency of the sources and the dedication, enthusiasm, and expertise of the teaching staff. The evaluation team was impressed with the high calibre and professional integrity of the English faculty. Despite differences of opinion about how writing should be taught, the morale of the faculty is extremely high, and on the main, a sense of cooperation and mutual respect throughout. Every instructor felt the strong yet warm administrative support of the

Assistant Dean. The course outlines show an unusual commitment to detail, which is very important when there is a large contingent of part-time instructors whose orientation to course rationale may be limited.

The 1A, 1B, and 1C courses work well and generate little controversy. The fact that a student can finish the remedial 21 series, and indeed receive an A.A. degree, however, without writing anything much longer than a paragraph, is certainly a major weakness of the program. More fundamentally, the 21 series seems to take little or no account of adult learning patterns, that is, the need of an adult to address a task in its entirety, rather than in seemingly irrelevant bits and pieces. In contrast to children, adults need immediate application of the skills they are learning. They don't have the innate desire to learn or the curiosity of the child--that wonder Piaget described. Unless they see the relevancy of what they are doing, and unless what they already know is recognized in some way, they will not be efficient learners. Perhaps this is why the same principles of punctuation, for example, have to be taught over and over every quarter. They are not learned in the context of some writing the student is interested in doing.

Further, the rationale of the 21 series seems to be somewhat off the mark, only incidentally addressing what a writer needs to know. These courses, with their premium on mechanics and correctness, seem to be designed to frustrate the teacher who is interested in challenging students to think, to feel the power of a cogent argument, a lucid explanation, an eloquent description written by their own hands, however painstakingly. There is so much emphasis on right and wrong that there appears to be little opportunity for the beginning writer to grasp the fundamental skills, much less the confidence necessary to put a piece of writing together: gathering details, organizing them around a main point, adjusting for a particular audience, and editing for smoothness and effect as well as correctness. There is little opportunity for the beginning writer to see himself as a writer at all. This is not to say that grammar, usage, and structure are not important and should not be mastered. Certainly these skills are necessary at a certain stage in the composing process. However, at Ohlone, the remedial student

doesn't seem to get much of a shot at the whole process, and this is a problem.

Diagnostic Counseling and Advising Procedures:

Students are placed in English composition courses by their scores in the ACT test. This has proved to be a fairly accurate system, and any inequities are dealt with immediately, since all instructors give students a written diagnostic exam during the first week of classes. Thus it is possible to move students up to a higher level if in fact they can write better than they perform on the ACT. Once students are "tracked" into the sequence, however, they cannot be sent back to re-take a course should they be ill-prepared.

for the next level. Thus, many students who enter 1A and score poorly on the diagnostic exam cannot be sent back for further work. The English department needs to articulate clearly defined standards of writing for entry into each level so that students may work towar proving their proficiency, rather than simply being promoted for having earned a marginal grade. It is especially critical that the standards for entry into 1A be defined in concordance with the requirements at the UC and CSUC campuses. Those campuses currently require students to be able to competently write a short, analytic essay in edited standard English before they enter 1A. At Ohlone, students who have gone through the 21C level have only been asked to prove their competence in writing paragraphs. The department should upgrade its standards of student performance and consider requiring students to do some essay writing before completing the 21C level.

Given the present system, advising by both instructors and counselors is very good. Students are given ample time and consider ation. They are properly informed, and, generally end up in the course which the system says they should be in. That the system is making students enroll in 1A before they are ready is not the fault of any individual's advice. The instructors and counselors are accessible, knowledgeable, and humane: Students benefit from close personal attention to their needs in their individual contacts with staff and faculty.

LABORATORY INSTRUCTION

The Setting:

The Writing Lab is part of a larger Learning Resource Center that includes the Library and a Math and Reading Lab. The Writing Lab itself consists of: one very large room used solely for distributing self-paced materials which account for the bulk of work done by students who use it; a spacious study area, where students can work on the modules or talk with a lab instructor; a testing area for pre- and post-testing, private tutoring rooms adjacent to the testing area (the Instructional Assistant's office is in this area, while the Lab Supervisor's office is in the materials room); and, finally, an open tutoring area with carrells for individual or group work. Except for the two private tutoring rooms, there is no area where students and tutors cannot talk together without worrying about noise level, since all open areas abut library space and lab instructors frequently "shush" groups of students. There is, therefore, no clear distinction of where a student goes to work quietly on modules and where a student goes to hear and be heard. Few institutions are blessed with the amount of space found in the Ohlone Writing Lab (most colleges have labs no larger that Ohlone's materials room), and a little re-organization of space easily could solve these problems involving conflicting activities.

The atmosphere in the lab reflects the conflicts that are apparent in the system itself. On the one hand the classified staff and their student aides are helpful and friendly, while on the other hand these very same warm human beings' main occupations are distributing forms and ensuring that all students conform to accepted, uniform procedures. The proliferation of the Writing Lab's procedures seem designed to justify the expansive quarters of the operation, when, in fact, it is people who should be using these luxurious accomodations for communication. However, the tutoring component of the Writing Lab, under the direction of the instruction assistant, is making inroads toward humanizing the atmosphere.

The System:

In 1972-73 the English department re-designed its course sequence to provide a sequence of three remedial courses (21A,B,C) that would prepare students for English 1A by taking them through a sequence of instruction on word, sentence, and paragraph curricula. The Writing Lab was founded as a pilot project in 1973 to provide support for this new sequence, and to guarantee that every student in the remedial courses would get instruction in basics.

In 1974, with the move to the new campus, the lab was formally established with materials written by faculty members. Decisions on which materials should be created were based on criteria tied to what the department felt instructors were ignoring in the classroom, either because instructors preferred to concentrate on other matters, or because they were reluctant to teach the basics. In order to be certain students paid attention to the basics, a system of procedures and deadlines was developed to enforce adherence to a systematic approach to learning. Students were required to participate, because one-fourth of their grade in each composition course through English 1B was determined by their lab performance. The English Department had noble intentions, as their statement of philosophy pointed to the need for a personalized, individual approach to writing instruction, but the system they created was founded on a limited view of what methods and materials should be included in a Writing Lab.

Lab Components:

There are two components to the Writing Lab:

1. Self-Paced Materials.
   Distributed from a centralized location, these materials consist of books of exercises designed as supplemental course work in English 20, 21A-B-C, and English 1A-B. Students are expected to spend an average of three hours per week working on these materials, and their grade on the materials counts 1/4 of their grade in the course. Materials are limited to specific problem areas.
2. Tutoring.
   Students may receive individual tutoring on a regular basis either through self-referral or instructor referral. Tutoring hours are limited,

and most time goes to ESL and EOPS students. Additional materials covering the complete spectrum of writing skills are available through the tutoring office.

A Writing Lab instructor is always on duty for students who want individual help on any aspect of writing. Most students, however, see the lab instructor only for help in re-taking post-tests.

Materials Evaluation:

The contents and effectiveness of the Writing Lab materials have been closely examined. The findings are presented in this section, and detailed notes on each unit can be found in Appendix A. The reader is cautioned, however, against viewing these recommendations in isolation from the major findings of the team in relation to the overall appropriateness of the composition course design and the design of the Writing Lab and its systems. The recommendations for individual modules in no way supercedes the team's conclusions about the concept and design of the lab. Each text was judged on its own merits.

Materials for All Courses

1. Steps To A Better Vocabulary by Atwell Scruggs (2nd edition)

Proposes to improve vocabulary by teaching word parts, but, in the process, also teaches other word attack skills such as dictionary, thesaurus, sounding-out, parts of speech, and contextual clues. Nevertheless the students are given the impression that memorizing word parts is all there is to vocabulary building, and the material does not encourage them to memorize words for their sake, nor does it caution them that all words cannot be deciphered through this approach. Types of exercises are limited to multiple choice and fill-in-the-blank. The book should be valuable to any student who conscientiously memorizes the material. Value is questionable if students don't take the initiative to follow-through and use newly learned vocabulary items in their own reading and writing. In itself, this book cannot be considered a comprehensive vocabulary building program. Students should be counseled in other methods of gaining word power. Except as noted in Appendix A, quality of exercises and examples is good to superior. Language is generally appropriate, and subjects are well-balanced between everyday life and academic concerns. A major fault is lack of pre-tests and inappropriate post-tests. Reading level seems appropriate: moves from 8th or 9th grade to first year college.

The college should continue using it in its present form, but augment it with a more comprehensive post-test which checks understanding of key words as well as word parts. For future revisions, the evaluation team suggests pre-tests for each level. These pre-tests would allow students to skip portions in which they already are competent, and measure progress and degree of mastery when compared to post-tests. The lab should add exercises which provide students with the opportunity to use words in context of their own sentences; supplement the list of word-parts with a selected list of key words which will then be tested for in post-test (the present list of key words is not selective, nor are students asked to memorize whole words as they are parts of words); and rewrite contextual clues exercises to increase progressively the level of difficulty (see notes in Appendix A).

English 20

The only materials for this course are the "Scan/Write" exercises for the hearing impaired, and they are good college prep (10 - 12th grade) reading comprehension materials. The Writing Lab should design some basic mastery learning units in sentence parts that are especially suited to ESL and bilingual students enrolled in English 20. Particular attention should be paid to verbs, idioms, and articles. The materials should be fully individualized with pre- and post-tests for each module.

English 21A

1. The Preposition and Prepositional Idioms by Atwell Scruggs

Except as noted in Appendix A, (especially "names") the examples are good. Clearly one advantage of locally produced materials is that the examples refer to relevant aspects of the environment (e.g., Oakland, BART, etc.). The instruction is sound, well-organized, and informed, although the evaluators can envision non-native speakers remaining in the dark about many words that change meaning with context (e.g., "ahead of" for "in front of" when compared to "getting ahead"). These students need the opportunity to discuss such idiomatic combinations with a native speaker. With some help from a tutor or through classroom practice, Unit II

should prove very valuable to many students, especially non-native and dialect speakers. It is essential, however, that they feel free to discuss some of the idiomatic phrases with a native speaker. In that sense, these materials cannot be called truly self-instructional. They must be augmented by practice in conversation. A major fault is the lack of pre-tests. Not everyone needs this type of instruction. The college should continue to use it in its present form, but add pre-tests for both units so that the modules will provide significant learning and not just become "busy-work". Steps need to be taken to identify students who need extra help with idiomatic expressions.

For future revisions, the evaluation team suggests alphabetizing phrase lists in Unit II, adding non-Anglo first and last names, and deleting poetry. (See notes in Appendix A for further suggestions for improvement.)

2. Verbs

A general introduction (review?) to verbs that presents the basics in a bare-bones format. Most speakers who qualify to take this unit (on the basis of the pre-test) probably are going to need more work on the subject within the context of more complex sentence patterns. For instance, there is nothing here on sequence of tenses (they get some exposure later in exercise 5 of Sentence Comprehension, but even that is cursory). Nevertheless, this is as good a place as any for them to start. Pre- and post-tests seem realistic, but they are also booby-trapped and very short. It is hoped no one flunks the pre-test because of confusion over terms (e.g., some texts call "progressive" verbs "continuous") or over forms of paradigms (e.g., some books list principal parts as present--past--past participle--present participle). The pre-test may actually be testing whether or not students know terms rather than how to use verbs. The college should continue to use it, but consider creating a more advanced unit on verbs for students who really need it. The college should also create a new pre-test that tests for more than terminology by offering items made up of sentences that need correct forms of verbs and by weighting the tests in favor of functional knowledge about how to use verbs.

1. Sentence Types by Atwell Scruggs

Presents basic sentence types with a minimum of confusion and subtleties. All of this is essential, primer type information. It could be boring work for many students. It's not nearly as challenging or as interesting as sentence-combining exercises. If students persevere and don't get bogged down, they will learn both the concepts and the labels necessary to go on to analyze and write sophisticated patterns. A strength of the materials is that students must write their own sentences in the exercises and they must get the instructor's feedback. This procedure can serve as a kind of contract between the two about what the students need to know. Lessons lead up to a good introduction to the whole idea of subordination, but they start at first grade. The college should continue using it, but individualize through pre-tests keyed to units.

2. Sentence Comprehension

There is a marked contrast in the reading level between these materials and Sentence Types. Sentence Types starts about first grade (necessitated by the lesson itself) and never goes much beyond eighth grade, while these exercises start about eighth and go into some quite sophisticated college level work. Moreover, the student has only four weeks with this material, but the entire quarter (at the instructor's discretion) with S.T. These materials come later in the course, so it seems essential that students would have finished S.T. before going on to these more advanced exercises. For instance, students need to be able to distinguish between phrases and clauses before they can do Exercise 3.

Except as noted, these exercises are well conceived and executed. Each section teaches valuable reading skills through appropriate college selections. The problem is that, because of their brevity, the exercises hardly offer anything more than an introduction to sentence comprehension. They would generally not be a great challenge to someone reading at twelve grade level, and too superficial for someone at eighth grade who needs more help and practice. The whole unit seems more diagnostic than instructive.

The college should continue using S.C. but at the same time create a pre-test for the entire unit, set up a referral system to the Reading Lab and/or instructor for students who need more work, and cross-index each exercise to programs in the Reading Lab that provide further instruction and practice.

3. "Punctuation Exercise"

With the few exceptions noted, this is a very good set of exercises on punctuation. It is by no means comprehensive and will not prepare students for all situations. It does cover some of the more troublesome problem uses, and certainly represents the bare minimum in a course which concentrates on the sentence. It is well-paced, with good correspondences between pre- and post-tests. Again, students need to be informed that they should look elsewhere, in a place like their handbook, for other rules of punctuation not covered here. The college should continue using it as is, but consider adding more items to the pre-test. The present scoring system leaves so little room for error that a perfect score is required to be passed out of a unit.

English 21C

1. Example Please by Atwell Scruggs (revised edition)

There are too many easy exercises and not enough attention to the details that so often trip students up in their own writing. For instance, they need to be told when not to use certain punctuation: e.g., don't use the semi-colon if one of the clauses is a fragment; don't use the comma to separate main sentence elements like SV and/or VO. (They are penalized for such mistakes in the tests, but they are never taught how to avoid such traps.) As some of the finer distinctions are explained and illustrated, they should be led to the realization that sometimes there is a strong element of authorial taste (choice) involved and that punctuating, especially comma usage, is not completely a matter or rules (but there are some pretty strong, inviolable rules about where not to punctuate). In sum, this text is on the one hand misleading, because it emphasizes practice on the easiest, most mundane rules, and inadequate on the other hand, because it does not fully explain certain

rules and does not warn against the most common errors of over-punctuation (see notes in Appendix A). The college should suspend use of this text and adopt one or more of the many commercial programs available, or, create a new text which surpasses the commercial products.

2. Paragraph Comprehension

Basically, this is a sound, well-conceived program that is executed very competently. Possible problems with answers to Exercise 4 (see notes). Of course, identifying various types of paragraph development will not teach students how to write such paragraphs--only practice will do that--but it does show them how to analyze models for emulation. Many very effective college composition texts use this approach. Students stand to gain a lot from this type of instruction and practice, but most texts go into further detail and are designed for classroom discussion, not self-paced labs. The first three exercises present basic instruction in reading comprehension and seem appropriate at this level.

The college should continue to use it, but add pre-tests for each exercise.

English 1A

1. Paragraph Writing Review

It's hard to see what this unit hopes to accomplish. The topics introduced here are worthy of in-depth treatment, and, if students haven't had this material before 1A, this "review" isn't going to teach them very much. Students who do know the material will find it both incredibly easy and boring, and they will get angry with the way things are classified in Unit IV. The level is really very low, even as a review; 1A students would be dealing with the analysis of entire articles and essays. The fact is that the material presented here is best learned in an environment of open intellectrual discourse (e.g., classroom discussion, tutorial, written comments on papers), not through the closed medium of exercises and tests. Most texts, for instance, that present this material do so in the spirit of stimulating discussion and thought,

not for the purpose of discovering right and wrong answers. Overall, the explanations here are reduced to a level so simple as to be useless.

The college should discontinue using Paragraph Writing Review. It should substitute a good handbook and/or reader. There are many on the market that do more justice to these topics than these scant, confusing materials, and that will allow more discretion to the instructors for individualizing instruction.

2. "English 1A Punctuation Review"

These exercises just repeat all the failings of Example Please. Moreover, the content of the selections, especially the post-test paragraphs, are at a very low reading level both in terms of difficulty and interest. Hardly seems like college work. As was said about the other punctuation materials, there is a marked tendency toward a journalistic tone, rather than an academic one. Students should be able to see parallels between these exercises and their textbooks and readers. The post-tests, with their paragraphs (a better context than sentences), would make better pre-tests at this level. The existing pre-tests, as with 21B, seem inadequate.

The college should take steps to improve the pretests, replace exercises with better material, (for instance, it may be necessary to distinguish between materials that review and those that are providing initial instruction, and this will depend on the percent of students in 1A who haven't had a thorough lesson in punctuation), and run punctuation workshops where students get practice punctuating their own sentences. (They won't learn how to punctuate by editing only other people's sentences in an artificially structured context like workbooks.)

3. Essay Comprehension

This is a well-done, superior text, but some questions need to be asked about intention and application. On the positive side, the selections are good, interesting, challenging college level (freshman) readings, and the introductory explanations are for the most part sound within the space allowed. The exercises and the answers are creative and about as flexible as they can be within this format. On the negative side, many selections are very topical

to the late 60's and early 70's and need updating. Considering that entire textbooks exist that address themselves to the kinds of distinctions made in exercises two and nine, and entire courses teach the skills dealt with in three and eight, the question has to be asked whether or not such lab work is truly "supplemental" to course work in 1A. Rather, it seems to parallel a lot of what should be going on in class discussion, and classroom and tutorial work is a better way to teach these thinking skills (see Descriptive Evaluation for Paragraph Comprehension in 21C). Students really need to discuss such reading assignments. The evaluators have no quarrel with the materials themselves; they seem well above average in comparison to other published materials. The concern is that students are being asked to learn some fairly complex thinking skills through a tightly structured medium of instruction that is better suited to drill on elements of grammar.

The college should consider integrating similar material into the regular classroom, and retain only parts for lab work, such as the three newly revised chapters. Each discrete exercise could have a pre-test, and instructors could refer students as needed. The amount of material definitely needs to be reduced, and decisions need to be made about the limitations of teaching thinking skills through self-paced instruction.

English 1B

1. Research Skills Booklet

The booklet provides ample practice for students in basic research skills. The tone is chatty, low keyed, but far too wordy. Use should be continued, and a pre-test developed. Any future revision should strive for a more concise writing style and a more accessible format.

Summary of Materials Analysis:

While certain modules seem adequate for their limited purposes and could be retained for use in a reconstructed program, most need some adjustment.

Retain	Pre-tests Needed	
Steps To A Better Vocabulary	**	improve post-test
The Preposition & Prepositional Idiom	**	individualize
Verbs		revise pre-test
Sentence Types	**	
Sentence Comprehension	**	
Punctuation Exercises		revise pre-test
Paragraph Comprehension	**	
Eng. 1A Punctuation Review		revise pre-test & exercises
Research Skills Booklet	**	

The following programs are inappropriate and/or ineffective: Example Please, Paragraph Writing Review, Essay Comprehension. All three should be replaced with more appropriate material.

English 20 needs a carefully individualized set of materials for the ESL student.

Additional Materials Suggestions:

Students have very few options for lab work, and the materials are limited to only a few areas. Additional materials should be provided which teach correction of the most common sentence errors (e.g., dangling modifier, reference of pronoun, passive construction, parallel structure, etc.) and which teach other composition skills so that students can come to the lab for help with any writing problem.

The Writing Lab Process

Students get their exercises either from the bookstore or the lab, and deadlines for assignments are set by the lab (except for Sentence Types, which is set by the instructor). As students work through the exercises, they self-correct either from answer keys contained in the texts or obtained from the lab clerk. They take their post-tests in a testing area, and must repeat the post-test if they score below 70%. There are three forms for each post-test.

According to the informed estimate of the full-time head clerk, 50% of the students must retake the post-tests. In most cases, students pass the second post-test (the major exception is Essay Comprehension; 50% of those taking the second post-test fail). This

explains why so much of the lab instructors' time is taken up with students preparing to take their second post-test. Few students see the lab instructor while they are working through the units. Why should they, when they have the answers in front of them? For the large number of students failing the first post-test, there is obviously not much learning going on while they are doing the exercises. They are using the answer keys to hurry through the work and not getting any real instruction until they see the lab instructor for help on a retake. Most students are probably not working three hours a week on lab materials. The lack of pre-tests in truly individualizing the work compounds the problem. Many students who don't need the instruction are probably using the answer keys to just fill in the blanks, since they know they will be able to pass the post-test.

Elaborate procedures have been designed to aid instructors in determining a student's grade for lab work, and, theoretically, the instructor is obligated to count the lab grade as one-quarter of a student's entire grade in the course. In practice, however, instructors exert considerable discretion in adjusting the three-quarters of the grade of class work up or down to either compensate for or to emphasize the lab grade. Students who fail the lab work, but do well in the class work, can still get a high grade in the course. Few students will fail their composition course because of an F in the lab work, but a low grade in lab work can help an instructor fail a student who is otherwise doing poorly in class work. It is probable that in most cases the lab grade does not account for one-quarter of the total grade. A number of students know this, and approach lab work in cursory fashion. The problem could be solved by redesigning the process using a comprehensive mastery learning model that employs pre-tests and proctors or tutors whom students must see at specified points in the workbooks for progress checks (Christ, Appendix B).

Tutoring

At present, tutoring is limited to ESL and EOPS students, partly because of funding limitations. An Instructional Assistant (classified) is chiefly responsible for training and supervising the tutors and

coordinating the delivery of services. Some EOPS tutors receive training in a credit course taught by the English department instructor responsible for coordinating the EOPS tutorial program. Most tutors receive on-the-job training consisting of conferences with the I.A. The I.A. screens all students referred for tutoring, and closely observes the progress of all tutorials in order to ensure that tutees are receiving proper instruction. Tutors are assigned to tutees based on a tutor's demonstrated expertise. Theoretically, no tutor should be working with a tutee who has a problem the tutor is not knowledgeable about. No regular training meetings are held for tutors, but they do have a large collection of materials (most students using the lab do not know these materials exist) available and the I.A. is very accessible. For those students using the tutorial service, it is the most valuable component of the Writing Lab. The instruction is of a high quality, due in large part to the sensitivity and conscientiousness of the I.A.

Tutoring is available to other students from the lab instructors, but such help is generally not utilized except when students must retake Writing Lab post-tests. Often the lab instructors have nothing to do, and spend their lab time marking student papers for their classes.

Limited small group tutoring is available at the end of each quarter to help prepare students for post-tests.

Tutoring help should be expanded to all students using the Writing Lab, not just ESL and EOPS. Peer tutoring should be utilized to a greater extent, whether the tutors be community volunteers or paid students, and lab instructors should spend more time working with students as they go through the lab materials. Small group tutoring should begin earlier in the quarter and meet more frequently. Funds should be reallocated and new sources of funding should be sought out to expand such services.

Tutors should be allowed to work with students on all phases of the composing process as well as on lab assignments, and they should receive regular training in the form of weekly seminars (in addition to frequent conferences with the supervisor). The I.A. should re-order priorities to increasing the effectiveness of tutor selection and

training rather than attempting to oversee and direct all tutorials (it is unlikely that, as services expand, any I.A. would be able to personally supervise each tutorial). A new model for tutor training should be implemented which places greater trust in the resourcefulness of tutors and provides them with ample sources of information and material that will answer the questions and quandaries they encounter while they are tutoring (Hawkins, Appendix B). Above all, tutors should be working on improving their own writing (Beck & Silver, Appendix B) while they are helping others to improve.

The Team's Point of View on Writing Lab Materials and Process:

The evaluation team believes students learn to write by writing. Exercises only can teach conceptual skills for understanding and structure of language and provide practice in editing skills. Learning to correct someone else's sentences will not in itself teach one to correct his/her own sentences. Students need extensive practice in writing and revising, and frequent feedback on their own writing to learn how to self-correct (Garrison, Appendix B). It is common knowledge in the profession that no amount of drilling on textbook exercises will make a student a better writer. Nevertheless, students can benefit from initial exposure to the basic concepts explained by such exercises if there is immediate application to their own writing.

One strength of any Writing Lab is that it can serve to guarantee that all students will receive the initial exposure so that they will understand the basic terms of criticism and concepts of good writing that will be used by their audience (instructors, tutors) in judging what they write. One weakness of any Writing Lab is that the initial stage may be overemphasized at the expense of aiding students as they become engaged in the process of writing (Harris, Appendix B). Most labs avoid succumbing to this inherent weakness by maintaining a flexible balance between structured, self-paced materials and responsive individual tutoring or proctoring (Christ, Appendix B). Some labs emphasize tutoring, some auto-tutorials (Hawkins, Appendix B), but not at the expense of the other.

Although there is regular tutoring available for EOPS and ESL students, the majority of students are exposed to a lab that is

lop-sided in its emphasis on product over process, limited in the kinds and types of available material, and that teaches lock-step form-filling over learning how to communicate. In the considered opinion of the evaluation team, the program would benefit from being redesigned, a process that should occur concurrently with a change in what is taught in the sequence of composition courses, and a rethinking of the English department's standards for student writing quality at each level. The sequence of composition courses may have to be changed to meet these new standards.

The English department possesses the talent and resources to accomplish the necessary changes. Many of the existing materials (e.g., verbs, sentence types, research skills) are sound enough to be adapted once a more individualized system is established. The scope of the materials can be broadened to include all categories of writing problems by building on the base of materials that now exist in the tutorial component, and then by making those materials an official part of the lab. A re-allocation of the lab instructor's time, greater utilization of peer tutors, and creative approaches to funding could provide a proctoring/tutoring system that would replace the present system.

Faculty/Staff Reactions to the Writing Lab:

All faculty were interviewed at least once and a number as often as three times by different members of the evaluation team. Five part-timers were surveyed by phone and in person. Both the Head Clerk and the Instructional Assistant were interviewed, as were students and assistants working in the study area. Additional students were interviewed at various spots around the campus and in the cafeteria. Interviewees were asked to elaborate on both the positive and negative aspects of the Writing Lab, and were told that they would not be quoted by name.

Among the positive aspects, the faculty mentioned the exceptional competence of the Head Clerk and Instructional Assistant. Both of these women also struck the evaluation team as being warm and caring as well as efficient. According the the Lab Supervisor, "they really run the lab." Since the supervisor is only on duty at the lab nine hours per week, this could hardly be otherwise. Issues of overwork

and low pay, of too much responsibility and not enough authority, were concerns expressed by several faculty about the lab's full-time personnel.

Most faculty felt that the lab work was an appropriate adjunct to what they were doing in class in the 21 series, and most approved the concept that the lab should serve English students on the transfer as well as the remedial levels. The most successful component is the 1B materials, which everyone finds right on the money. The most controversial component is the 1A materials, which have been so soundly criticized that they are already in the process of being revised. There is some contention, however, that reading and reasoning skills can never be taught according to a multiple-choice format. Another criticism is that the persons revising the materials no longer teach 1A, and may have lost touch with the major problems of the course.

Many instructors mentioned the beneficial aspect of students having to fill out forms and accustom themselves to the paperwork of middle-class society. Some said this is in fact the only significant accomplishment of the lab, since most of the skills are not applied and, hence, soon forgotten. Some instructors said they worried about the intimidating paperwork and dehumanizing atmosphere, particularly for minority students.

Several instructors pointed out the lack of true individualization in the lab, since there are few pre-tests and most students must go through all the exercises whether they need them or not. Some thought this kind of repetition was valuable.

Although the lab is to have an instructor on duty at all times, the function of this person seemed somewhat vague to the faculty. Most instructors said they felt uncomfortable trying to help students with written assignments apart from the lab, because they couldn't be sure they weren't leading the student astray, depending on the idiosyncrasies of the student's "real" instructor. Students often needed help preparing for a second post-test, but this seemed to be primarily because the student had finished his exercises quickly with the help of the answer key and thus found himself at odds with

the first post-test. To remedy this, the suggestion was made not to give the student the answer key until he'd finished the exercises, and also to provide further exercises, rather than instructor help, to students who flunked the first post-test.

A general criticism of the lab was that it is too traditional, too pattern-oriented, and too deductive (here's the rule, now you apply it to these exercises). "Students don't get any opportunity to manipulate what they have learned--there isn't enough writing in the lab." Many felt that the lab, like the 21 courses, really had little bearing on students' actual writing abilities.

On the other hand, the tutoring program was acknowledged to be extremely helpful in making a direct impact. The fact that this program had reached its saturation point with the number of existing tutors was a source of real regret for many who would like to see much more of this kind of individualized assistance. A common theme was that it would probably be even more difficult to find competent tutors than to find the money to pay them. Another difficulty is ascertaining how much of a paper is a tutor's handiwork rather than a student's.

Despite very hard work and excellent intentions, many of the faculty and staff seem to have a limited concept of the function of a lab and a tutor. They see the lab as a place where exercises are done, checked, and filed. They see the tutor as a facilitator for students with unique needs, such as ESL, hearing-impaired, or EOP students. The concept of the tutor as a peer who can be trained to individually diagnose and remediate, at any level, using a student paper at hand, without doing the student's work for him, seems to be a foreign notion.

Although the lab may be a big ADA money-maker, much of its potential for making better writers is not being realized.

Student Questionnaires

Two questionnaires were administered to students in the cafeteria, the Writing Lab, and "around and about" the campus. One questionnaire was for students who currently are using the lab, and another for those who had used it. The questionnaire used a

"forced-choice" response pattern. The responses were computer analyzed by mean scores for each question, frequency, and percent.

Of 100 current users of the Writing Lab, 42 percent indicated they used the lab 11+ hours per quarter and 52 percent checked that the level of English they were initially counseled into was "inappropriate" for them.

As shown in Table 1 (page 31), the median responses were very positive.

Of 100 past users of the Writing Lab, 35 percent indicated they used the lab 11+ hours per quarter and 46 percent checked that the level of English they were initially counseled into was "inappropriate" for them.

As shown in Table 2 (page 32), again the response of students to their experiences in the Writing Lab were very positive. These results, however, should be viewed with some caution. There was not enough time for the evaluation team to obtain reactions from those who tried the lab and found it lacking. Thus the results are skewed in favor of respondents who succeeded--invested their time and energy and made the system work for them.

TABLE 1: RESPONSES OF STUDENTS WHO ARE USING THE WRITING LAB

		1	2	3	4
1. The general atmosphere in the Writing Lab is:					
1. very helpful	FREQ	(25)	(49)	(18)	(1)
2. helpful	%	(27)	(53)	(19)	(1)
3. somewhat helpful					
4. of little or no help					
2. The Writing Lab's routines and proceedures are:		1	2	3	4
1. very helpful					
2. helpful		(18)	(49)	(22)	(4)
3. of some help		(19)	(53)	(24)	(4)
4. of little or no help					
3. The assignments I do in the Writing Lab are:		1	2	3	4
1. very helpful					
2. helpful		(19)	(45)	(21)	(8)
3. of some help		(20)	(48)	(23)	(9)
4. of little or no help					
4. The materials I am working with in the Writing Lab are:		1	2	3	4
1. very helpful					
2. helpful		(24)	(39)	(22)	(8)
3. of some help		(26)	(42)	(24)	(9)
4. of little or no hel					
5. The Writing Lab experience is tied-in with the instruction in my English class(es):		1	2	3	4
1. very closely					
2. closely		(24)	(30)	(29)	(10)
3. somewhat closely		(26)	(32)	(31)	(11)
4. with very little or no connection					
6. The tutors in the Writing Lab are:		1	2	3	4
1. very helpful					
2. helpful		(34)	(29)	(20)	(4)
3. of some help		(39)	(33)	(23)	(5)
4. of little or no help					
7. As a teacher of writing, my English instructor is:		1	2	3	4
1. very helpful					
2. helpful		(43)	(29)	(11)	(7)
3. of some help		(48)	(32)	(12)	(8)
4. of little or no help					
8. As teachers of writing, the instructors on duty in the Writing Lab are:		1	2	3	4
1. very helpful					
2. helpful		(26)	(42)	(17)	(2)
3. of some help		(30)	(48)	(20)	(2)
4. of little or no help					
9. In reporting the completion of assignments in the Writing Lab, students are:		1	2	3	4
1. very honest		(15)	(49)	(22)	(1)
2. honest		(17)	(56)	(25)	(1)
3. somewhat honest					
4. show little or no honesty					
10. Information about the READING LAB is generally:		1	2	3	4
1. very available		(19)	(44)	(22)	(4)
2. available		(21)	(49)	(25)	(5)
3. somewhat available					
4. unavailable					

TABLE 2: RESPONSES OF STUDENTS WHO HAVE USED THE WRITING LAB

		1	2	3	4
1. The general atmosphere of the Writing Lab was:					
1. very helpful	FREQ	(8)	(23)	(11)	(3)
2. helpful	%	(18)	(51)	(24)	(7)
3. of some help					
4. of little or no help					
2. The Writing Lab's routine and proceedures were:		1	2	3	4
1. very helpful		(11)	(16)	(10)	(8)
2. helpful		(24)	(36)	(22)	(18)
3. of some help					
4. of little or no help					
3. The assignments I did in the Writing Lab were:		1	2	3	4
1. Very helpful		(9)	(15)	(16)	(4)
2. helpful		(20)	(36)	(36)	(9)
3. of some help					
4. of little or no help					
4. The materials I worked with in the Writing Lab were:		1	2	3	4
1. very helpful		(7)	(23)	(12)	(3)
2. helpful		(16)	(51)	(27)	(7)
3. of some help					
4. of little or no help					
5. The Writing Lab experience was tied-in with the instruction in my English Class(es):		1	2	3	4
1. very closely		(12)	(14)	(14)	(5)
2. closely		(27)	(31)	(31)	(11)
3. somewhat closely					
4. with very little or no connection					
6. The tutors in the Writing Lab were:		1	2	3	4
1. very helpful		(6)	(24)	(7)	(8)
2. helpful		(13)	(53)	(16)	(18)
3. of some help					
4. of little or no help					
7. As a teacher of writing, my English instructor(s) was (were):		1	2	3	4
1. very helpful		(18)	(19)	(3)	(4)
2. helpful		(41)	(43)	(7)	(9)
3. of some help					
4. of little or no help					
8. As teachers of writing, instructors on duty in the Writing Lab were:		1	2	3	4
1. very helpful		(13)	(17)	(11)	(4)
2. helpful		(29)	(38)	(24)	(9)
3. of some help					
4. of little or no help					
9. In reporting the completion of assignments, in the Writing Lab, students were:		1	2	3	4
1. very honest		(13)	(17)	(16)	(0)
2. honest		(28)	(37)	(35)	(0)
3. somewhat honest					
4. showed little or no honesty					
10. Information about the READING LAB generally was:		1	2	3	4
1. very available		(10)	(18)	(11)	(4)
2. availbale		(22)	(40)	(24)	(13)
3. somewhat available					
4. unavailable					

Student Interviews

Most students who were interviewed generally were supportive of the Writing Lab; indeed, when stopped at various spots around the campus and asked to evaluate the program, their remarks confirmed the findings of the questionnaire. Some typical comments follow. (The course number that each student had completed is shown with his/her remarks:)

21A-B: (This was a Black student who had dropped out of 21C)

"I didn't put too much effort into my lab work. Yes, I think most students use the key card to do the work. There were so many students with the teacher that you had to do everything on your own. I just tried to go in and get it over with."

1A summer school:

"I hadn't had any English in a long time, so the lab was an excellent review for me. I thought it was a good place to sit and write, a very nice atmosphere. I remember the whole thing as a good experience, except for the verbal introduction we were given. It all sounded horribly complicated: fill out this form, fill out that form. I almost quit there at the beginning."

1A:

"Part of it was helpful, but most of it was boring. You just learn a lot of stupid rules and forget them right after the test. Also, the English teachers should believe in the lab! The instructors themselves said the lab was worthless."

21B, C, 1A, 1B:

"The Writing Lab helped a lot when the teacher didn't explain things well. I usually did the work myself. I feel that the 21 series did prepare me for 1A, although the problems I had in 1A were with sentence structure--run-ons and so forth. Of all my classes, 21B was the least enjoyable. It had too much technical stuff. I liked 1A and 1B where I could write about a topic. The other stuff just bored me."

1A, 1B:

"Most people get the answer key and just copy off of it. People don't take the lab seriously, because the lab work doesn't seem connected to the class, except for 1B. 1B was the best! None of my other classes have required essays or term papers."

21A, B, C, 1A:

"The repetition, quarter after quarter, helped me. I finally started getting it in 21C. I really needed to start from scratch. I hate English, but it's a necessity. I used the answer key to do my work all the time, especially for the vocabulary sections. I think the only way you can remember vocabulary words is to apply them. Sometimes the lab work, especially in essay comp., didn't follow the same thing as the course. The essay comp. of 1A was the dumbest thing I've been through. I really don't know what it was supposed to do. Also, most of the lab instructors wouldn't help me with a paper I was writing, because they don't know what the other teacher wants. But I definitely think the lab should be kept."

Summary

The goals articulated in the English department's "Writing Lab Philosophy" generally have not been realized. Specifically (in the words of the department's statement), the lab lacks both variety and depth in the way it attempts to meet student needs; it is not capable of serving all elements of the student community; it does not deliver its services in a personalized manner; it has not achieved a balance between materials and person-to-person contact; it is not flexible enough to serve both the remedial and advanced student with a whole sequence of skill building activities; and it does not have a variety of materials and media available to all students. The Writing Lab has succeeded in establishing itself in an enviable working environment with ample space and facilities, so that on the surface, at least, there appears to be no stigma of being a place only for the "bonehead" student; certain practices and procedures, however, contribute to a separation of students within the lab itself. For instance, individual tutoring

is reserved for the most needy, form-filling is prized over human contact, the lab instructor sits where everyone can see which students get "extra help," signs discourage talking, and students generally don't have the opportunity to work together in an open atmosphere where tutors and instructors circulate freely. Of all the original goals only one was unrealistic: that peer tutors be "limited to specific types of duties or responsibilities."

Findings and Recommendations for the Writing Program

The first finding is:

There is a strong college-wide commitment to the idea of a Writing Lab and to individualized instruction.

The first recommendation is:

This commitment should be continued and firmly supported.

The second finding is:

Faculty standards for judging the quality of student writing are vague and out-of-step with UC and CSUC practices. A number of the faculty said they were out of touch with current research and practice in the teaching of writing.

The second recommendation is:

A coordinated program of faculty development should be instituted for all English department faculty and include: (a) current research in the teaching of writing, (b) professional conferences and visits to labs in other colleges and universities, and (c) discussion of standards for written composition.

The third finding is:

Once students are "tracked" into the English course sequence, they cannot be sent back to re-take a course should they be ill prepared for the next level.

The third recommendation is:

The option of referring a student back to re-take part or the whole of a remedial course should be provided.

The fourth finding is:

The sequencing of remedial courses on word, sentence, and paragraph ignores the need for a broad application of these skills in the production of extended intellectual discourse.

The fourth recommendation is:

Essay writing should be integrated at all levels of instruction; the emphasis on mechanics in the 21 series should be balanced with more emphasis on composing; and the word, sentence, and paragraph approach should be modified by integrating skills with the development of logic and reasoning. This means changing the course sequence.

The fifth finding is:

Faculty/staff morale is high, they are dedicated professionals, but lab supervision is inconsistent and varies in quality.

The fifth recommendation is:

A full-time lab instructor should be assigned to supervise the lab for a significant period of time with office space in the lab.

The sixth finding is:

Too much space, energy, and time is given to materials, forms, and bookkeeping.

The sixth recommendation is:

The materials room should be converted to an open tutoring room, the materials housed in less spacious quarters, and forms should be consolidated, simplified, or eliminated as much as possible.

The seventh finding is:

Students receive the full measure of advising assistance, and the responses of students showed strong, positive support for, and satisfaction with, the present system.

The seventh recommendation is:

Continue the present diagnotic/advising procedures, and continue to obtain feedback from students regarding the

programs, including those students who drop-out of it.

The eighth finding is:

The lab setting is excellent for instructional purposes, and the staff is exceptionally competent and accessible to students. The process is, however, characterized by the proliferation of lock-step procedures.

The eighth recommendation is:

Lab procedures should be personalized and made flexible in order to serve both the remedial and advanced student with a whole sequence of skill-building activities and a variety of materials and media available to all students.

The ninth finding is:

The available materials are limited in scope, and the process of using them is not individualized or adequately monitored.

The ninth recommendation is:

The process should be individualized by an adequate system of pre-tests and proctoring, a greater variety of materials should be provided in the lab, and more flexibility and variation should be provided in order to serve the diverse needs of all student

The tenth finding is:

There is little correlation between student performance in the lab and the quality of their writing.

The tenth recommendation is:

Writing proficiency should be the sole criterion for the course grade, rather than use a student's score on a lab test as a partial measure of evaluation of writing proficiency.

The eleventh finding is:

Tutoring provides true individualized instruction in the lab, tutor supervision and the tutoring itself are of high quality, the tutors' roles are unnecessarily constricted, and tutors receive minimal training.

The eleventh recommendation is:

More peer tutors should be used, the necessary funding found

to expand tutoring for all students, tutors' roles should be expanded to include working with students on all steps of writing a paper--pre-writing through editing, and the present tutor training program should be upgraded appropriately (Hawkins, Appendix B).

Section 3: THE READING LAB

The Reading Lab is located in Building 1, which also houses the library and Writing Lab. The Reading Lab is in a large room adjacent to the Writing Lab on the fourth floor. Students enter through the library and walk upstairs to the Reading Lab which is easily identifiable. Building 1 is a modern, well-designed, well-lit structure that is beautifully furnished.

The Setting:

The Reading Lab facility is a large room approximately 50% larger than an average classroom, and accommodates 30 to 40 students. The room is modern, well-furnished, well-lit, and well-organized to meet the needs of students. Large tables are located in the middle of the room for work on individualized materials, and study carrells line the outside wall. The front of the room contains the instructional assistants' desk, files, and materials. The back of the room and the inside wall are lined with materials. All of the materials are very well-organized and displayed in an attractive, easily recognizable fashion.

The Reading Lab gives one the impression of a highly efficient, well-organized operation. The room is beautiful, warm, and spacious. Materials and hardware are well-situated to be efficient, attractive, and useful to the students and staff. The design of the room and the arrangement of materials and hardware accommodate individualized learning extremely well. In fact, the entire lab context is arranged and equipped for individualized, self-paced learning, including self-paced materials, self-paced audio-visual units, and materials, and audio-cassette units and materials. Sony video-cassette units and screens are located in study carrells along the outside walls; Craig readers are found in the same area in individual study carrells. Many tape recorders are found in the front of the room for student use. In the rear of the lab, Language

Master units and materials are arranged against the wall.

The lab is designed to teach all levels and types of reading-study skills through an individualized, self-paced approach. Another room on the third floor is used for tutoring. The lab supervisor has a separate office that adjoins the Reading Lab for records and administrative functions.

The Reading Lab is not designed at present for small-group work in reading or study skills, nor is it designed for small-group or one-to-one tutoring. Tutoring is done in a separate room down the hall from the Reading Lab.

Thus, the lab is specifically organized, staffed, and equipped for self-paced instruction on an individual basis. The hardware, materials, room, and furniture are modern and well-designed to accomplish this goal.

The System:

Students are referred to the Reading Lab through the general catalogue, schedule of classes, orientation sessions with counselors, individual sessions with counselors regarding reading/studying problems, faculty members in other departments, and English department faculty. The course offerings of the lab are listed in the general catalogue and the schedule of classes. They are also described by counselors during orientation sessions prior to registration and by English faculty during the first week of classes. The English faculty administer the Nelson-Denny Reading Test in class, and inform the students who need work in reading and study skills. Reading Lab staff attend English classes during the first week of classes to describe the course offerings of the lab.

When students are referred to the lab, they are encouraged to register for one of the lab courses: English 31 through English 38. At present there is no drop-in tutoring. Students who register for English 23, which is a reading and study skills lecture course, are required to work in the lab one hour a week. English 31-38 are all individualized, self-paced courses with flexible scheduling for each student in the course. The Reading Lab courses are:

English 31--Vocabulary Improvement

English 32--Skimming-Scanning Techniques

English 33--Improvement of Learning Techniques

English 34--Rapid Reading

English 35--Reading Rate Improvement

English 36--Improvement of Word Attack Skills

English 37--Reading Comprehension Improvement

English 38--Spelling Improvement

Each course listed above gives the student one unit of academic credit per quarter. All work is completely individualized, and the student selects three weekly lab hours that fit into his/her schedule. Students work at their own rate, and there is no homework required.

Upon registering for one of the reading lab's courses, the student is given the Nelson-Denny (if he/she has not taken the test in one of the other English Department Courses), the Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test, and the Wide Range Achievement Test to determine the appropriate instructional level for materials, specific skills, weaknesses and strengths. If students score below the seventh grade level on the Nelson-Denny, they work on the materials for the course with a tutor. If they score above the seventh grade level, their work will be largely self-paced, without tutoring (except when problems occur or questions need to be answered).

An instructional assistant is present at all times to help the student in using the materials that are assigned. The lab supervisor (or course instructor) assigns the specific materials to be used by the student and tutor. Usually, however, most of the students in any one lab course follow a set sequence of materials if they read above the seventh grade level with variations occurring because of specific individual weaknesses. Part-time reading lab course instructors are present in the lab 12 hours per week to assist students. The Reading Lab supervisor is present in the lab six hours per week to perform administrative functions and select materials for students based on their diagnostic test scores and progress on course materials.

The daily routine for a student consists of finding his/her

folder that has been examined by the reading course instructor, reading the instructions or notes made by the instructor, finding the materials marked for use by the instructor, using the materials and performing the exercises (obtaining assistance when necessary), recording answers on the worksheet in the folder, and returning the folder to the instructional assistant when finished.

If the student has been assigned to work with a tutor, then the tutor performs the above steps (except, of course, actually doing the exercises for the student). The tutor finds the appropriate material designated by the instructor in the student's folder, explains the instructions and nature of the exercises to the student, helps the student with any questions about how to do the exercises, and records the student's answers along with the type of material used in the student's folder.

Lab instructors examine students' folders, assess their progress, and make notations regarding the type of material they should use during the next lab session. Lab instructors and the instructional assistants answer questions that students or tutors might have concerning these directions, the use the materials, problems in answering questions, how to use equipment, etc.

All materials have instructions for their use, explanation of skills to be learned, and exercises to be performed contained in a lesson-by-lesson sequence so that the student can use them in a self-paced, individualized fashion. Many of the materials have such explanations presented in an audio-visual or audio mode as well as print.

Tutors work only with students who initially read below the seventh grade level on the diagnostic test administered at the beginning of the lab course. Tutors are trained by viewing audio-visual training tapes on policies, procedures, reading skills, study skills, and materials of the lab. Tutors also attend a meeting every four weeks to discuss the progress that their students are making or any problem that might be occurring. Lab tutors basically function as monitors of student progress. They help students understand instructions listed in materials, but they do not actually do much tutoring or teaching of reading or study skills, nor are they trained to do so.

Students move from skill package to skill package so that they

cover all of the reading skills or study skills contained in a particular lab course. The materials for each course are sequenced and administered in a logical, coherent fashion both in terms of grade level/skill improvement and the type of skills to be covered in a particular course. Students work on a skill material until they have mastered that skill at different reading levels and then move on to the next material in the skill-building sequence in that particular course. Thus, the Reading Lab is fundamentally designed for self-paced, individualized instruction and the type of student who works well under those conditions.

Role of the English Department Faculty and Counseling Department in Advising:

As mentioned earlier, English faculty administer the Nelson-Denny Reading Test the first week of class and encourage low-scoring students to register for one or more of the Reading Lab courses. Reading Lab staff are invited to speak to English students about the type of courses offered by the Reading Lab and the benefits of taking such courses. Throughout the quarter, English faculty refer students who may need reading or study skill instruction. Faculty members from other departments also make referrals to the Reading Lab when they determine that a student could benefit from reading and/or study skill instruction.

The Counseling department conducts small group orientations for new students each quarter. During these sessions, the Reading Lab course offerings are described to the students and they are encouraged to take advantage of those courses to improve their reading and study skills. During the quarter, counselors also refer students who display some need for assistance in reading or study skills.

Analysis of Materials:

Even though the materials are self-paced and self-contained, students still need to have a professional reading instructor help them understand the skills to be learned and the application of those skills to various content materials. A significant amount of each instructor's time is allocated to administering the materials and correcting answers in student folders. The Reading Lab supervisor is present in the lab six hours per week to perform administrative functions and select

materials for students based on their diagnostic test scores and progress on previous course materials.

Students who enroll in English 37, "Reading Comprehension Improvement," who score above the seventh grade level on the diagnostic tests, are assigned to either the Videotaped Group materials or the RFU Kit Group materials. Once one set of materials has been completed, the student moves on to the set that he/she was not assigned to originally. Students must work on both of the above sets of materials before they are assigned to three Study Skills Vidiotapes.

The Videotaped Group materials consist of the following comprehension lessons:

1. Part One: Recognizing paragraph topics and main ideas
2. Part Two: Recognizing Signs and Signals
3. Part Three: Recognizing Paragraph Patterns
4. Part Four: Recognizing Paragraph Roles

These "Videotaped Comprehension Lessons" make use of the Sony videocassette playback unit The student obtains the appropriate cassette and "Tactics in Reading" booklet. The student places the videotape in the Sony playback unit and receives instructions. The student is guided through the exercises in the book by an instructor on the videotape who helps the student to understand the skills and concepts to be mastered in each part listed above. The student completes the exercises at the end of each instructional unit and records his/her answers on the worksheet in the student folder. These answers are corrected by the lab instructor.

The Videotaped Comprehension Lessons are excellent. The directions and instructions are very clear. The student is given a thorough explanation of the skill involved and how to apply it to a particular passage. The questions and answers are analyzed in light of the passage and the skill involved. The "Tactics in Reading Series" (Books I, II, III, IV) are excellent comprehension improvement materials with well-written passages, clear instructions, good comprehension exercises, and logical organization and presentation. They include all of the paragraph comprehension skills that should be included in a reading comprehension course: recognizing paragraph topics and main

ideas, recognizing signs and signals, recognizing paragraph patterns, and recognizing paragraph roles.

The RFU Kit Group materials consist of cards with paragraphs and comprehension exercises. This is an SRA "Critical Reading" kit with passages and exercises that increase in difficulty and cover the following skills:

1. Inference of key or main ideas implied in paragraphs
2. Inference of specific or detailed information implied in paragraphs
3. Identification of information irrelevant to the topic of discussion

The student spends nine lab hours on the RFU kit beginning with the card designated by the reading instructor.

The RFU Kit developed by SRA is an excellent critical reading skill material. It has well-written passages and questions that develop the reading skills listed above. This kit is self-contained and very thorough. The student has access to an abundance of good paragraphs and questions.

The Videotaped Comprehension Lessons and the RFU Kit expose the student to all of the major comprehension skills in a very thorough fashion, and accomplish the course goals in an effective manner:

1. To develop the student's ability to make inferences from written material and to recognize the author's purpose.
2. To develop the student's comprehension of sentences, paragraphs, and larger sections.
3. To develop the student's ability to distinguish main ideas, primary supporting details, and secondary supporting details.
4. To develop the student's ability to analyze the organizational structure of paragraphs and to recognize irrelevant statements.

The Study Skills Videotapes do a thorough job of covering the following topics: PQ3R Study Method, how to remember better, and how to concentrate better. These videotapes are also used on the Sony videocassette playback unit. The quality of the tapes is very

good with clear explanations of the topics listed above. The same format is followed on the study skills tapes as on the Videotaped Comprehension Lessons.

Once the student has completed the Videotaped Comprehension Lessons, nine lab hours of using the "Reading for Understanding Kit," and the three "Study Skills Videotapes," he/she has the option of deciding to continue using the Reading for Understanding Kit or to start one of the following "Supplementary Comprehension Materials":

1. Reading Attainment System. This material includes interesting articles followed by comprehension questions and skill-building exercises to develop reading comprehension skills.

2. Read to Succeed. This material includes units on word attack skills, dictionary skills, comprehension skills, vocabulary skills, and study skills taught through text and audiocassette tapes.

3. Probe. This material contains eleven skill-building units that cover all of the major comprehension skills: understanding paragraphs, inference, purpose, and vocabulary. The skills are taught through text and audiocassette. This is one of the best comprehension improvement materials in the field.

4. Basic Reading Power. This book is extremely well-written and covers the following skills: sentence reading, paragraph meaning, flexibility, comprehension, and rate of comprehension. This material contains specific explanation and practice for basic reading power skills. The book includes progressive discrimination comprehension tasks and answer keys. The student can use this material in a self-paced fashion on an individualized basis. It is extremely thorough and covers all of the necessary skills for basic reading power (intermediate grade levels).

5. SRA College Reading Programs 1 and 2.
This is a reading comprehension program consisting of well-written passages and comprehension questions. The materials

include paragraph comprehension skills at a wide range of grade levels.

6. Rhetoric and Critical Thinking. Educulture produces these minicourses which include audiocassette tapes and module booklets with critical thinking exercises. This material contains a good explanation of critical thinking skills and sound exercises.

7. The final group of supplementary materials consists of comprehension skill books written by Joffe: Finding Main Ideas, Understanding Paragraph Relationships, Understanding Figurative Language, Reading to Discover Organization, Critical Reading Improvement and Problem Solving Improvement. These books are well written for developmental students.

All of these materials are designed to facilitate self-paced, individualized learning, and they are among the best available in the field. These materials are generally very interesting, well-written, and well-conceived. They contain thorough exercises for the mastery of skills. These materials more than adequately cover the comprehension skills that are listed in the course description: Sentence reading, sentence comprehension, paragraph comprehension, and critical reading skills. An appropriate wide range of reading grade levels are included in the diversity of the supplementary comprehension materials.

The skills covered in the Videotaped Comprehension Lessons, RFU Kit, and Supplementary Comprehension Materials cover all of the comprehension skills that should be included in a college comprehension improvement course, and they are taught in a very thorough and interesting manner. The materials are well organized and administered, and they are all designed to be as self-paced and individualized as possible. The course goals are excellently achieved through an efficient system of administering materials, monitoring students' progress, and assisting students in the mastery of comprehension skills through personal instruction.

Students who enroll in English 31, "Vocabulary Improvement," are given the Nelson-Denny Reading Test which includes a test of

vocabulary level. Based on the student's pretest results, a group of materials are prescribed for that student. All students in the course use the following two units first: How to Use the Dictionary (Level I and II) and Learning to Use Context Clues (Level I and II). The How to Use the Dictionary material consists of a booklet and matching audiocassette that cover the following topics: abbreviation key, running heads, restrictive usage labels, and multiple meanings. The Learning to Use Context Clues material consists of a booklet and accompanying audiotapes that cover the following topics: direct definition, indirect definitions, inference in context, examples in context, personal experiences.

Both of these learning units are self-paced, individualized materials with complete instructions, exercises and questions. They are well-written and thorough introductions to the topics of learning to use the dictionary and learning how to understand the meanings of new words from context.

After completing the two units described above, the student can choose from the following list of vocabulary improvement materials:

1. Bergen Evans Vocabulary Program. This program consists of a booklet and accompanying audiocassettes. Words are presented to the student in sentences and the student is encouraged to use the word in a sentence. The Bergen Evans program is a well-conceived college level vocabulary improvement material that is among the best in the field. It stresses a "words in context approach", and is very effective.

2. Basic Vocabulary Skills. This book is self-paced and organized to cover prefixes, roots, suffixes, context clues, and application to specific subject matter. The primary goal of the book is to teach the student how to increase his/her vocabulary. It is a good intermediate level vocabulary building material.

3. Word Power Made Easy. This book is a standard of most high school and college vocabulary improvement programs. It covers a variety of high-frequency academic words. The book

is well-written, interesting, and thorough. The text features a good introduction to each new word, a pronunciation key, and a number of mastery exercises. The author uses a "word structure" approach emphasizing roots, prefixes and suffixes.

4. Vocabulary 1000. This book is designed to be self-paced, including programmed instruction, exercises, and answers. It uses a "word structure" approach which stresses the mastery of roots, prefixes and suffixes.

5. EDL Word Clues. This material consists of booklets and accompanying audiocassettes. The booklets are written on different reading levels to cover a wide range of new vocabulary words. The material stresses a "words in context" approach. It is well-written and well-conceived.

6. Educulture Vocabulary Development Program. This program consists of nine booklets and accompanying audiocassettes that cover the following skills: how to use the dictionary, prefixes, roots and suffixes, words in context, working with look-alike words I and II, working with sound-alike words I and II, commonly misunderstood words, commonly misunderstood words grades 12-14. This is a very thorough vocabulary improvement program that covers a wide range of words. It is clear and well designed for use by the student in an individualized, self-paced manner.

7. Wordcraft Vocabulary Program. The program consists of a student workbook and accompanying audiocassette tapes. It features a "words in context" approach with a pronunciation guide. This program is extremely well written and covers a wide range of intermediate level words. Wordcraft is interesting and well designed for student use.

8. Vocabulary Mastery Program (Language Master). This program consists of sets of cards with vocabulary words, sentences, and definitions that are played on a Language Master. This allows the student to hear the correct pronunciation of a word, to hear the word used in a sentence with two definitions,

and to compare his pronunciation of the word with the correct pronunciation.

9. Language Master English Development Program. This program consists of the same basic materials and procedures listed above for the Vocabulary Mastery Program. It is designed for ESL students, and allows them to learn the correct pronunciation and definition of English vocabulary.

All of the above materials have been designed to be used for self-paced, individualized instruction. They combine to provide the student with a thorough vocabulary building experience that covers a complete range of topics, skills, and words appropriate for college students at all levels of development. They are well organized, interesting, and administered in an effective manner to achieve the course goals:

1. To increase the knowledge of the meanings of words in general vocabulary and in specific subject fields.
2. To develop the awareness of various types of context clues and the ability to use them effectively and accurately in recognizing unknown words.
3. To acquire the skills needed to use the dictionary efficiently and effectively.
4. To develop the ability to recognize the common prefixes, suffixes, and root words and to use these in unlocking word meanings.
5. To develop an awareness of words having multiple meanings and the ability to apply the appropriate meaning to the context in which the word is used.

Almost every material in the lab was examined for content and effectiveness within the context of a two-year college reading lab that must serve a population of students who are very diverse in skill and grade level achievement. The reading comprehension and vocabulary development materials were specifically examined for their appropriateness within this context. The reading comprehension and vocabulary materials, as well as the other materials in the lab, are of the

highest quality and directly fulfill the requirements of thorough skill-building materials which are used in a self-paced, individualized instructional program. They completely cover the range of reading, comprehension, study skills, and vocabulary skills that should be taught on the two-year college level. The materials show a great deal of flexibility to meet the needs of two-year college students. They are generally interesting and organized in an effective manner. The exercises are thorough and enable the student to master each skill and to understand its applicability to his/her own reading. The instructions are clear and complete. The materials are written to include a wide range of reading levels, ensuring that students will develop the ability to apply each skill to college level work as they progress through the exercises and ensuring that students of diverse reading ability and needs will find the program appropriate.

The materials are organized, displayed, and administered in an effective manner. Students use the materials, perform the exercises, and answer the questions. The questions and answers are reviewed by the staff, and the next material in the sequence is prescribed. The staff give personal instruction, and answer any questions that students might have regarding the materials, skills, or exercises. The only weakness that exists is the lack of certificated staff to work with students on the materials. Students need personalized instruction even though lab materials are designed to be used in a self-paced instructional program. At the present time only 18 of the 50 total lab hours are covered by certificated personnel. Over 280 students use the lab each week. More professional staff are needed to plan a completely individualized program for each student and to personally instruct each student to ensure the mastery of skills. This also would enable the lab to offer small group instruction for non-traditional students (during set hours) who may need additional guidance and instructor contact to master skills effectively.

More trained tutors are needed to assist students who are having difficulties using particular materials. There are plenty of materials of excellent quality, but many students need guidance in the use of them. Only a limited number of students (those who score below the seventh grade level) receive such guidance at this time. Training seminars should be conducted on a weekly basis to teach tutors <u>how</u> to

tutor reading skills, rather than to just monitor a student's progress.

The chief concern of the evaluators is that the materials are more than sufficient to meet the needs of students at Ohlone College. The weakness lies in the lack of certificated staff to provide completely individualized instruction, sufficient instructor contact, and diversity of format to ensure that all students effectively master the skills appropriate to their needs.

The Team's Commentary:

The lab setting is excellent, but too small to accomplish the present goals of the college vis-a-vis development reading/study skills instruction or recommended goals of particular Reading Lab staff and English faculty members. It is well-equipped with hardware, materials, furniture, lighting, etc., but there are space limitations. The tutoring room is far from the Reading Lab. There is no room allocated for small group tutoring or small group reading/study skill instruction.

The lab system is well thought-out, designed, organized, administered, and equipped, given the present space, staff, and budgetary limitations. There is a wide range of materials in almost every skill area that are of excellent quality. The present staff function very effectively. There is, however, a distinct need for more certificated staff. Presently there is not enough contact between students and certificated staff. This decreases the quantity and quality of instruction that goes on in the Reading Lab. More staff would also ensure that tutors are trained and supervised thoroughly. At present there is not enough tutor training in how to teach reading and study skills on a one-to-one basis. Tutors function as monitors more than tutors. Given the present budgetary limitations, it is a strong point that the lab can even supply tutors that function in this fashion. The tutors that were interviewed were generally well-trained to perform a monitoring function. They displayed knowledge of the materials, procedures, and policies of the lab, and were genuinely concerned with helping students.

The present staff is excellent, but the lab should be staffed with a full-time certificated reading specialist to provide more continuity. At present, reading specialists only cover 18 out of the 50 lab hours

per week. The lab supervisor is very good, but her hours are extremely limited and should be extended. The instructional assistants are outstanding in both competence and empathy.

The present lab is well designed, administered, organized, and equipped for self-paced, individualized instruction and the type of student who functions well under those conditions. It does not have the facilities or staff to accommodate those students who do not react well to this approach. Students with diverse learning styles and needs, including some non-traditional or minority group students, tend not to function well when using self-paced materials without a great deal of personal interaction and assistance. The present lab is understaffed to respond to this type of need and lacks the space to carry it out.

Faculty, Staff, Tutors' Reactions:

Interviews were used to obtain data to determine how adequately the Reading Lab has been functioning as perceived by faculty, staff, tutors, and students in terms of materials, staff, courses, tutoring, facility, and atmosphere. Among those interviewed were the Reading Lab Supervisor, the Instructional Assistant, a former Reading Lab Supervisor who is currently an English instructor, including English 23, two English 23 instructors, the English department faculty as a whole, the head of the Counseling department and several counselors, three tutors, the evening instructional assistant, and a number of students.

An analysis of the interview data displays almost unanimous agreement that the Reading Lab is functioning extremely well given the current budgetary and staff limitations. Only one person interviewed dissented from this view. All others praised the lab in terms of materials, staff, atmosphere, tutoring, course offerings, and general service to students. Two English 23 instructors stated that the Reading Lab needed more certificated staff so that more interaction could occur between students and certificated personnel. They also mentioned that the present facility was inadequate for the developmental reading-study skills needs of the college.

One former Reading Lab Supervisor suggested that the lab should have small-group tutoring and small-group instruction in reading/study

skills. This person also suggested that the lab was too quiet, somewhat cold, and also mentioned that the lab did not accommodate a diverse range of learning styles such as those possessed by some minority or non-traditional students.

These comments were not refuted by others. Instead, other staff stated that recommendations had been made to improve the Reading Lab, but that given the lack of funds, such improvements have not been forthcoming. Such staff members suggested that given the present budgetary and staff limitations, the Reading Lab was doing an outstanding job.

Two English faculty members mentioned that the use of part-time reading instructors resulted in a lack of continuity in the Reading Lab. They recommended that a full-time reading instructor should be hired instead.

All of the staff, faculty members, and tutors that were interviewed seemed to be extremely competent and concerned about the welfare of students. There was almost unanimous agreement that the lab is doing an outstanding job, and that lab courses, materials, procedures, and staff are excellent. Only one person dissented from this view, but this criticism can be largely understood as the result of insufficient space and staff due to budget limitations, rather than any inherent deficiency in the present lab.

Student Interviews:

The students who were interviewed included some who were doing their work in the Reading Lab and some EOPS students who came to a special meeting for this purpose. Observers also read many student evaluation forms which gave reactions to their work in the lab. So this section deals with the reactions of student users; students who dropped out of the program were not included in the evaluation.

Student users are very positive about the lab. They gave the staff, particularly the instructional assistants, consistently high marks for their competence and their concern. Reactions to instructors and tutors were a little less enthusiastic, but that appeared to be more a function of the limited amount of time they spent with the students.

The reading students also gave high marks to the ambiance of the

lab. They consistetly appreciated the lab's quiet "learning atmosphere." Several wished that other areas of the library were as conducive to study and learning. There were some students, however, who described the atmosphere as somewhat inhibiting. These students expressed the wish for a "warmer" lab where they felt more welcome and able to converse above a whisper. Some also expressed a wish that tutoring work could be accomplished nearby. Several also noted that they would like more contact and feedback from lab personnel--either tutors (some didn't know they existed or thought of them as clerical assistants), instructional assistants, or instructors. A few students felt that the same goals could be achieved well (or better) in small group settings.

Students generally gave their learning materials high marks. They felt they had a good range to choose among, good guidance in making the choices, and good results. They uniformly felt they made good progress in reading skills because of the materials. The only mild criticisms came when they described some of the video and audio tapes as on the boring or monotonous side. This is an area that the Reading Lab staff is already working to correct through their plans to revise some materials.

The high praise given by the student users must be evaluated very carefully, because these students represent the successes. These are the students who found out about the lab, chose to use it, and stayed around until the end of the quarter. They are the ones whose learning style was compatible with the system. Others may not have found enough choices available to achieve their goals and Ohlone's goals for reading-study skills.

Student Questionnaires

Three questionnaires were administered to students in the cafeteria, the Reading Lab, and "around and about" the campus. One questionnaire was for students who currently are using the lab, one for those who had used it, and another for those who had never used it. The questionnaires used a "forced-choice" response pattern. The responses were computer analyzed by mean scores for each question, frequency, and percent.

Of 100 current users, 90 percent indicated using the lab 35 or more hours per quarter and 60 percent did so because they had been told it would help them. As shown in Table 3 (page 57), the median responses were very positive. The one exception was the somewhat negative response to the item on how well the Reading Lab experience was tied into English 23.

No information was secured from students who tried the Reading Lab, and for whatever reasons, did not complete the program. Thus the data reported were from a population of "successes."

Of 100 past users, slightly more than half stated they used the lab 35 or more hours per quarter and slightly more than half did so because they had been told it would help them. As shown in Table 4 (page 58), again the responses are very positive and again the only low item is the tie-in with English 23.

Of 200 students who never have used the Reading Lab [1]:

30 (15%) said they didn't have the time
110 (55%) said they didn't need it
50 (25%) said they had never heard about it
30 (15%) indicated they didn't have the time
10 (5%) checked they were not interested

[1] Comparable data regarding the Writing Lab were not obtained, since all students are required to use it.

TABLE 3: RESPONSES OF STUDENTS WHO ARE USING THE READING LAB

		1	2	3	4
1. The general atmosphere in the Reading Lab is:	FREQ.	(6)	(7)	(0)	(0)
1. very positive	%	(46)	(54)	(0)	(0)
2. positive					
3. slightly negative					
4. negative					
2. The routine and proceedures of the Reading Lab are:		1	2	3	4
1. very helpful		(6)	(6)	(1)	(0)
2. helpful		(46)	(46)	(8)	(0)
3. of some help					
4. of little or no help					
3. The work I am doing in the Reading Lab is:		1	2	3	4
1. very helpful		(6)	(6)	(1)	(0)
2. helpful		(46)	(46)	(8)	(0)
3. of some help					
4. of little or no help					
4. The materials I am working with in the Reading Lab are:		1	2	3	4
1. very helpful		(6)	(6)	(1)	(0)
2. helpful		(46)	(46)	(8)	(0)
3. of some help					
4. of little or no help					
5. The autotutorial (working on your own) feature of the Reading Lab is:		1	2	3	4
1. very helpful		(6)	(5)	(2)	(0)
2. helpful		(46)	(39)	(15)	(0)
3. of some help					
4. of little or no help					
6. My Reading Lab experience is tied into English 23:		1	2	3	4
1. very positively		(0)	(2)	(3)	(3)
2. positively		(0)	(25)	(38)	(38)
3. somewhat positively					
4. with little or no relationship					
7. The tutors in the Reading Lab are:		1	2	3	4
1. very helpful		(5)	(5)	(1)	(0)
2. helpful		(46)	(46)	(9)	(0)
3. of some help					
4. of little or no help					
8. With respect to the Reading Lab, the English Faculty is:		1	2	3	4
1. very supportive		(7)	(4)	(0)	(0)
2. supportive		(64)	(36)	(0)	(0)
3. somewhat supportive					
4. unsupportive					
9. The Reading Lab personnel are:		1	2	3	4
1. very helpful		(7)	(5)	(0)	(0)
2. helpful		(58)	(42)	(0)	(0)
3. of some help					
4. of little or no help					
10. The counseling and advice I am receiving about the Reading Lab is:		1	2	3	4
1. very helpful		(7)	(4)	(1)	(0)
2. helpful		(58)	(33)	(8)	(0)
3. of some help					
4. of little or no help					

TABLE 4 : RESPONSES OF STUDENTS WHO HAVE USED THE READING LAB

		1	2	3	4
1. The general atmosphere in the Reading Lab was:	FREQ	(13)	(15)	(0)	(0)
1. very positive 2. positive 3. slightly negative 4. negative	%	(46)	(54)	(0)	(0)
2. The routine and proceedures of the Reading Lab were:		1	2	3	4
1. very helpful 2. helpful 3. of some help 4. of little or no help		(7)	(15)	(6)	(0)
		(25)	(54)	(21)	(0)
3. The work I did in the Reading Lab was:		1	2	3	4
1. very helpful 2. helpful 3. of some help 4. of little or no help		(3)	(19)	(5)	(1)
		(11)	(68)	(18)	(4)
4. The materials I worked with in the Reading Lab were:		1	2	3	4
1. very helpful 2. helpful 3. of some help 4. of little or no help		(11)	(14)	(2)	(1)
		(39)	(50)	(7)	(4)
5. The autotutorial (working on your own) feature of the Reading Lab was:		1	2	3	4
1. very helpful 2. helpful 3. of some help 4. of little or no help		(8)	(16)	(4)	(0)
		(29)	(57)	(14)	(0)
6. My Reading Lab experience was tied into English 23:		1	2	3	4
1. very positively 2. positively 3. somewhat positively 4. with little or no relationship		(3)	(7)	(4)	(4)
		(17)	(39)	(22)	(22)
7. The tutors in the Reading Lab were:		1	2	3	4
1. very helpful 2. helpful 3. of some help 4. of little or no help		(11)	(6)	(6)	(2)
		(44)	(24)	(24)	(8)
8. With respect to the Reading Lab, the English Dept. faculty was:		1	2	3	4
1. very supportive 2. supportive 3. somewhat supportive 4. unsupportive		(8)	(13)	(4)	(0)
		(32)	(52)	(16)	(0)
9. Reading Lab personnel were:		1	2	3	4
1. very helpful 2. helpful 3. of some help 4. of little or no help		(11)	(9)	(4)	(0)
		(46)	(38)	(17)	(0)
10. The counseling advice I received about the Reading Lab was:		1	2	3	4
1. very helpful 2. helpful 3. of some help 4. of little or no help		(5)	(14)	(3)	(1)
		(22)	(61)	(13)	(4)

Summary

The Reading Lab setting is excellent given the current space, staff, and budgetary limitations, but it is too small and does not have the staff to accommodate small group tutoring and instruction that would be beneficial to students with diverse learning styles, including some non-traditional or minority group students. Part-time reading instructors do not provide the necessary institutional continuity needed in the Reading Lab between students, staff, tutors, and instructors. Only 18 out of 50 lab hours are presently covered by certificated reading instructors, a problem which decreases the amount of reading and study skill instruction that occurs. Students do not have the chance to interact with instructors as much as they should.

Even if the present facility cannot be expanded, hiring full-time instead of part-time reading instructors would provide more instructional continuity. More full-time reading instructors would ensure adequate reading and study skill instruction in the lab at all times. Expanding the facility and staff would provide group tutoring, drop-in tutoring, and small-group instruction. This would accommodate those students who do not necessarily want to take a complete Reading Lab course and those students who do not react well to self-paced, individualized instruction.

Strengths:

At present, the Reading Lab is an excellent model of self-paced, individualized reading/study instruction. It provides students the opportunity to master a wide range of reading/study skills appropriate to the needs of two-year college students. The lab facility is conveniently located on the fourth floor of the library and readily accessible to students. The room is spacious and well organized for individualized instruction. The staff is friendly, competent, and concerned with helping students master reading/study skills at all levels. The lab is open an extended period of time each day, covering morning, afternoon, and evening hours.

Students are individually diagnosed through standardized reading tests to determine their specific skill needs and reading level. Materials are selected and prescribed from a wide range of offerings

for each student's use. The student's progress is monitored and evaluated with new materials being assigned upon completion of each learning module until he/she has satisfactorily mastered each set of skills.

The staff handles in-take procedures in an efficient manner. Each student receives a folder with complete information about lab offerings, procedures, and policies. The student is shown video-tapes for orientation and description of lab materials. The materials are organized and arranged in an attractive, usable manner. There is a wide range of materials for instructors and students to choose from. The materials have been selected for use in a self-paced lab. Those materials that were not completely designed to be used in a self-paced manner by the publisher have been organized to accomplish this end. Instructions have been added where necessary. Audio-visual aids also have been added to allow the student to use such materials in an individualized manner. The published materials cover a wide range of reading/study skills. They are current and among the most effective materials for teaching such skills. Students who score poorly on the diagnostic tests are assigned to a tutor to help them understand how to use the materials and to monitor their progress.

Weaknesses:

The lab is understaffed with certificated personnel. Almost two-thirds of total lab hours are not supervised by certificated personnel. Many of the hours that are supervised are covered by part-time reading instructors who do not provide enough personalized instruction and continuity of instruction. The Reading Lab's self-paced individualized approach is not suited for all students, particularly minority and other "non-traditional" students who have a history of not functioning as well under systems that lack a great more personal involvement and frequent contact by instructors. The lab lacks the capability for small group and personal, individualized instruction that would more effectively accommodate such diverse learning styles. More tutors and tutorial areas also would help accomplish this goal.

Students tend to be assigned to the same initial set of materials

if they score above the seventh grade level on the diagnostic tests. These materials are good, but if more staff were available, each student could be given a completely individualized program of instruction suited to his/her specific needs. More certificated staff are needed to help these students on a one-to-one basis once they have been given an individualized program. In order for students to master/learn reading and study skills, they usually need more personal instruction than is presently available in the Reading Lab.

The Ideal:

Given the present physical, financial, and personnel limitations, the Reading Lab is performing efficiently.

The ideal situation would be to have:

1. more space for student learning,
2. a few more materials so students wouldn't have to wait for the ones they need,
3. some tutoring and small group instruction space,
4. a certificated person in the lab whenever it is open,
5. an instructional assistant in the lab whenever it is open,
6. a clerical assistant (either classified or student) whenever the lab is open, and
7. more tutors.

It isn't enough just to say what is ideal. The evaluation team recognized that almost anybody can do a better job if they have more space, more resources, more staff, more dollars. The findings and recommendations point to ways these goals might be achieved.

Findings and Recommendations for the Reading Program

The first finding is:

There is a strong college-wide commitment to the idea of a Reading Lab; the Reading Lab is an excellent model of self-paced, individualized reading/study skill instruction, and as such, fulfills the necessary requisites for this

individualized instructional approach; the lab is effectively organized to provide self-paced instruction, and the materials in it are arranged in an attractive, usable manner.

The first recommendation is:

This commitment should be continued and firmly supported.

The second finding is:

Questionnaire and interview responses of students showed they were satisfied with, and strongly support, the present system.

The second recommendation is:

This finding should be viewed with caution, since these responses were from the "successes," and data need to be secured from students who used the lab and dropped it during the quarter or students who never used the lab.

The third finding is:

The present system requires all students to be lockstepped into signing-up for a 30-hour, one unit of credit lab course.

The third recommendation is:

Students should be allowed to sign-up for more than one unit of credit, and a rationale should be developed for a 20-hour, one unit, "lecture lab" course with more instructional and tutorial assistance than presently available.

The fourth finding is:

Students do not have sufficient contact with certificated personnel to ensure mastery of concepts and skills, and the lab is understaffed with respect to certificated personnel.

The fourth recommendation is:

A full-time credentialed Lab Supervisor should be assigned and another certificated Lab Supervisor employed for the evening offerings on a part-time basis.

The fifth finding is:

No space is earmarked for tutorial or small group instruction.

The fifth recommendation is:

Alternative space should be assigned for tutorial or small group instruction. Some possibilities might be to use the current Lab Supervisor and part-time instructor offices as tutorial and small group instruction space.

The sixth finding is:

The Reading Lab's self-paced, individualized approach is not suited to the needs of all students, particularly minority and other non-traditional students who have a history of not functioning well under systems that lack more personal involvement.

The sixth recommendation is:

Individual and small group tutoring and instruction should be provided that would be beneficial to students with diverse learning styles, including non-traditional or minority group students.

The seventh finding is:

The lack of certificated and tutoring staff in the lab limits the amount and kind of truly individualized instruction that takes place, and there is a corresponding loss of potential ADA to the college.

The seventh recommendation is:

Tutoring ADA should be generated; one way is to offer a more formal tutor training course, another way is to have a "Tutor Practicum" class or a "Directed Study" course that students could take to earn credit for study that exceeds their other course requirements. Other solutions to the staffing problem are to recruit reading instructors who have or can qualify for a Basic Credential, solicit volunteer tutors from the community, or supplement the budget for the increased staff needs of the lab with non-district funds, such as EOPS, Vocational Education Act, or Special Education.

Section 4. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A team of five external evaluators studied the Writing and Reading Labs at Ohlone College at the joint request of the college administration and the faculty of the English department. This was a formative evaluation designed to improve the programs. The team reviewed documents; performed a detailed analysis of the self-paced, individualized learning materials housed in the labs; interviewed and queried administrators, faculty, staff, tutors, and students; spent five days on the campus observing the labs' operations and atmosphere, and assessing the available physical and human resources.

Specifically, the evaluation addressed these questions:

1. How adequate are the labs' diagnostic procedures, prescriptive processes, and materials?

2. How effective are the personnel--instructors, supervisors, tutors--when working with students in the labs?

3. How well integrated is the English classroom instruction with the Writing Lab's instructional materials?

4. What are the Reading and Writing Labs' strengths and weaknesses as perceived by students, English department faculty, lab personnel, and the Counseling staff?

5. How effective are the labs in achieving their purposes as stated in their philosophies, and what suggestions and recommendations will improve them?

The basic criterion for data analysis and recommendations was the extent to which the labs were achieving the purposes for which they were established.

Findings and Recommendations for the Writing Lab

The first finding is:

There is a strong, college-wide commitment to the idea of a Writing Lab and to individualized instruction.

The first recommendation is:

This commitment should be continued and firmly supported.

The second finding is:

Faculty standards for judging the quality of student writing are vague and out-of-step with UC and CSUC practices. A number of the faculty said they were out of touch with current research and practice in the teaching of writing.

The second recommendation is:

A coordinated program of faculty development should be instituted for all English department faculty and include: (a) current research in the teaching of writing, (b) professional conferences and visits to labs in other colleges and universities, and (c) discussion of standards for written composition.

The third finding is:

Once students are "tracked" into the English course sequence, they cannot be sent back to re-take a course should they be ill-prepared for the next level.

The third recommendation is:

The option of referring a student back to re-take part or the whole of a remedial course should be provided.

The fourth finding is:

The sequencing of remedial courses on word, sentence, and paragraph ignores the need for a broad application of these skills in the production of extended intellectual discourse.

The fourth recommendation is:

Essay writing should be integrated at all levels of instruction; the emphasis on mechanics in the 21 series should be balanced

with more emphasis on composing; and the word, sentence, and paragraph approach should be modified by integrating skills with the development of logic and reasoning. This means changing the course sequence.

The fifth finding is:

Faculty/staff morale is high, they are dedicated professionals, but lab supervision is inconsistent and varies in quality.

The fifth recommendation is:

A full-time lab instructor should be assigned to supervise the lab for a significant period of time with office space in the lab.

The sixth finding is:

Too much space, energy, and time is given to materials, forms, and bookkeeping.

The sixth recommendation is:

The materials room should be converted to an open tutoring room, the materials housed in less spacious quarters, and forms should be consolidated, simplified, or eliminated as much as possible.

The seventh finding is:

Students receive the full measure of advising assistance, and the responses of students showed strong, positive support for, and satisfaction with, the present system.

The seventh recommendation is:

Continue the present diagnostic/advising procedures, and continue to obtain feedback from students regarding the programs, including those students who drop-out of it.

The eighth finding is:

The lab setting is excellent for instructional purposes, the staff is exceptionally competent and accessible to students. The process, however, is characterized by the proliferation of lock-step procedures.

The eighth recommendation is:

Lab procedures should be personalized and made flexible in order to serve both the remedial and advanced student with a whole sequence of skill-building activities and a variety of materials and media available to all students.

The ninth finding is:

The available materials are limited in scope, and the process of using them is not individualized or adequately monitored.

The ninth recommendation is:

The process should be individualized by an adequate system of pre-tests and proctoring, a greater variety of materials should be provided in the lab, and more flexibility and variation should be provided in order to serve the diverse needs of all students.

The tenth finding is:

There is little correlation between student performance in the lab and the quality of their writing.

The tenth recommendation is:

Writing proficiency should be the sole criterion for the course grade, rather than use a student's score on a lab test as a partial measure of evaluation of writing proficiency.

The eleventh finding is:

Tutoring provides true individualized instruction in the lab, tutor supervision and the tutoring itself are of high quality, the tutors' roles are unnecessarily constricted, and tutors receive minimal training.

The eleventh recommendation is:

More peer tutors should be used, the necessary funding found to expand tutoring for all students, tutor's roles should be expanded to include working with students on all steps of writing a paper--pre-writing through editing, and the present tutor training program should be upgraded appropriately (Hawkins, Appendix B).

Findings and Recommendations for the Reading Program

The first finding is:

There is a strong college-wide commitment to the idea of a Reading Lab; the Reading Lab is an excellent model of self-paced, individualized reading/study skill instruction and as such fulfills the necessary requisites for this individualized instructional approach; the lab is effectively organized to provide self-paced instruction, and the materials in it are arranged in an attractive, usable manner.

The first recommendation is:

This commitment should be continued and firmly supported.

The second finding is:

Questionnaire and interview responses of students showed they were satisfied with, and strongly support, the present system.

The second recommendation is:

This finding should be viewed with caution, since these responses were from the "successes," and data need to be secured from students who used the lab and dropped it during the quarter or students who never used the lab.

The third finding is:

The present system requires all students to be lockstepped into signing-up for a 30-hour, one unit of credit lab course.

The third recommendation is:

Students should be allowed to sign-up for more than one unit of credit, and a rationale should be developed for a 20-hour, one unit, "lecture lab" course with more instructional and tutorial assistance than presently available.

The fourth finding is:

Students do not have sufficient contact with certificated personnel to ensure mastery of concepts and skills, and the lab is understaffed with respect to certificated personnel.

The fourth recommendation is:

A full-time credentialed Lab Supervisor should be assigned and another certificated Lab Supervisor employed for the evening offerings on a part-time basis.

The fifth finding is:

No space is earmarked for tutorial or small group instruction.

The fifth recommendation is:

Alternative space should be assigned for tutorial or small group instruction; some possibilities might be to use the current Lab Supervisor and part-time instructor offices as tutorial and small group instruction space.

The sixth finding is:

The Reading Lab's self-paced, individualized approach is not suited to the needs of all students, particularly minority and other non-traditional students who have a history of not functioning well under systems that lack more personal involvement.

The sixth recommendation is:

Individual and small group tutoring and instruction should be provided that would be beneficial to students with diverse learning styles, including non-traditional or minority group students.

The seventh finding is:

The lack of certificated and tutoring staff in the lab limits the amount and kind of truly individualized instruction that takes place, and there is a corresponding loss of potential ADA to the college.

The seventh recommendation is:

Tutoring ADA should be generated; one way is to offer a more formal tutor training course, another way is to have a "Tutor Practicum" class or a "Directed Study" course that students could take to earn credit for study that exceeds their other course requirements. Other solutions to the

staffing problem are to recruit reading instructors who have or can qualify for a Basic Credential, solicit volunteer tutors from the community, or supplement the budget for the increased staff needs of the lab with non-district funds, such as EOPS, Vocational Education Act, or Special Education.

The Final Word

In terms of the basic criterion established for this evaluation, the data indicate that the labs are not achieving the purposes for which they were established to the full extent possible. The team's recommendations would, if implemented, enable lab practices to match the ideals so eloquently voiced in the statements of philosophy governing the operation of the Ohlone College Writing and Reading Labs.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Notes on Writing Lab Materials

Item: Steps to A Better Vocabulary by Atwell Scruggs (2nd edition)

Page

7 - 10 — Why do students need to know whether the source is Latin, Greek, or Anglo-Saxon? Seems distracting, especially since no such distinction is made with suffixes and since students are not tested on their knowledge of derivation.

35 — Are dictionaries readily available in the lab to do such exercises? Do students bring their own? Some instructors complain that students never open a dictionary.

27 - 38 — Multiple choice defeats purpose of "Contextual Clues" chapter since reader is responding to clues in the three possible answers rather than in the sentence. Should be scored using written answers rather than multiple choice.

Good to have many lessons on context since this is a very important tool in vocabulary building.

43 - 46 — In general the "Reducing Wordiness" is a fine way to teach precise word choice, and this is a good chapter with the exception of the following errors:

44, #9 "By terrorizing [who:], . . ." Broad Reference
46, #4 "Michael's behavior [,] based ... be [,] is ..." commas needed

Most of the sentences are quite good as illustrations of wordiness. Great way to teach vocabulary and incidentally teaches contextual clues.

There are a healthy number of exhortations to use the dictionary, but I wonder how many students will take the easy way out and try to learn from the answer keys.

47 — It's potentially misleading for students to just list synonyms from the Thesaurus. The trouble most students have with Thesaurus is not using a good dictionary to check the shades of meaning. They need to be encouraged to always use a Thesauraus in conjunction with a dictionary, except when they are absolutely certain of a word's meaning. The exercise on page 48 is better in this regard, and the answer key encourages going to the dictionary (but too late).

Parts of speech are being taught in "Related Forms". Great!

It concerns me that sutdents are not being asked to write any sentences or read any extended passages using new words.

One of the strengths of the exercises is that they train students to do more than just memorize word parts. The variety of approaches to word building is good. Too bad the post tests only test word parts.

page

175 - 178 Contextual clues exercises do not increase in difficulty as level of vocabulary increases. For instance, beginning at about Level III or IV the context should be gradually changed from short units to longer units, from the sentence to the paragraph to whole articles so that more subtle contextual clues might be taught. Most of the sentence clues are too obvious and the sentences themselves are unnatural (in other words, students aren't going to find such sentences in their reading).

tests Post tests seem too easy. All they do is test against the core list of word parts (not words), when, if in fact the student has conscientiously done all the exercises, he/she will have learned much more. I think most students would find this test a breeze and feel unchallenged and unrewarded. It doesn't really test whether or not they have learned any new words.

Why isn't there a pre-test based on the most difficul words taught at each level so that we can tell if anything is being learned and so that students can know which exercises they might skip, which they might concentrate on?

Item: The Preposition and Prepositional Idioms by Atwell Scruggs

page

15, #4 Another correct choice would be "up to"

23, #5 In some situations"by" would be a correct response; for example, it this statement were in response to the question, "Can I call Ruth at midnight?"

23, #7 "almost" is also correct

38, #23 typo: "When you lose you temper ..."

The contrast in the exercises between multiple choice and fill-in-the-blanks is good, but, as the examples above indicate, more care should be taken to allow for alternate correct answers.

26 I would assume that some ESL or bi-lingual students will be using this text. Such students may find the poems more confusing than helpful, since they include non-standard, even unidiomatic usage ("How are you in today...") In general, I don't see what the poems add to the text.

1 - 40 Unit 1 is very basic and needs a pre-test.

39, #43 "When Mike gets home at night, his wife greets him (with, by) a big kiss and a cool martini." Very objectionable content. Both culturally and sexually biased.

page

all exer. There should be more spanish surnames added to the exercises. Christian names are also mostly Anglo. Any aware minority would be alienated by the cultural context of these materials.

37 - 40 This unit review is good preparation for the post-test.

44 - 50 Since this is such a long list, why not alphabetize it so that it would be more accessible? Same comment applies to other modules in this unit. To make exercise #2 more challenging, I suggest adding the following direction: "You may substitute a pronoun for the object whenever it is appropriate to do so."

58, #27 "Being a liberated woman, she refuses to wait on her husband." Such controversy after p. 39, #43? You are vindicated.

all exer. NAMES: The Smiths,Jane, Steve, Jack, Mrs. Parker, Mr. & Mrs. Nixon, John, Jill.... Somewhat of a constricted world view.

65 "A few of these combinations appeared in Module 1 and Module 2. These may be used without objects."
→ a confusing reference

Unit 1
Post-test Answer keys
Form Z, #5 This is very useful detective work to allow for correct alternatives. Prepositions require close watching.
#3 Isn't "in" also acceptable?
Obviously, frequent review of these answers is advisable.

Unit II
Form Z, #17, Test sheet
typo: "mare" for "more"

all post-tests
Level of difficulty O.K., but not comprehensive enough. Add another ten or twenty items.

Item: Verbs

11 "The infinitive 'carry' is easier to write than listing: carry, carries, carried, will carry, the spelling changes with different subjects and tenses." Run-On sentence with aberrant syntax that is confusing to read.

11-14 Useful section on distinguishing verbals from verbs. However, an opportunity is lost here to teach the distinction between gerund and participle, terms students are presented with later in lab materials.

Item: Sentence Types by Atwell Scruggs

page	
12 & 14	Why avoid labeling adverbs and gerunds as such?
16	Avoids calling an infinitive an infinitive
22 & 28	This format makes it virtually impossible to avoid seeing the answer before reading the question. Not so much of a problem in later units when answers become more complex. Compare to format of English 3600.
all	NAMES: Joe & Terry, Mike & Mary, etc. See notes for Prepositions for comment.
55 - 60	Nowhere is it explained what the criteria should be for choosing clauses that may be joined with nothing but a semi-colon.
65	"I sent my classmate whom you met a get-well card." Do you know anyone who talks this way? Or writes?
all	Exercise sheets provide students with essential practice in creating their own sentences.

Item: Sentence Comprehension

Exer. #6	For this exercise to be a real learning experience, the key should include an explanation of why the wrong answers are unacceptable.
29	"...we use punctuation to indicate places where oral pauses would help to clarify our meaning." A very misleading statement. A frequent cause of student error is that they will put commas only where they think there is a pause in a sentence. The fact is that a lot of punctuation has nothing to do with pauses.
30	Paragraph B. "He loved his dog." is a non-sequitur in this paragraph. If a student wrote a paragraph like this, she would be criticized. Also, why are these called paragraphs? They are not complete paragraphs. This is a very poor sample exercise and should be replaced with a sample sentence more like the ones used in the actual exercise (which has no "paragraphs").
Exer. #8	These are quite clear and useful.
Post-tests	Very thorough

Item: Punctuation Exercises (21B)

Unit II. This unit is quite good on the comma for introductory words, clauses, and phrases. It might be useful to point out that some very short introductory words or phrases do not need to be set off by commas if they do not cause ambiguity. However, they will never be wrong by inserting the commas. For example, "Until that moment she hadn't appreciated the spiritual side of his nature." (Random House Handbook) "Often I'm just too tired to study." "At the meeting(,) there were two observers from Uganda." (Fernwald, English Grammar Simplified, Funk & Wagnalls, says it would be wrong to place a comma afer this phrase.) You could, for instance, compare your sentence #15 in Exercise 15, "After he had danced, the waltz did not seem as difficult as it had before," to this sentence: "After a moment the student admitted that TV wasn't his only distraction from studying." (Pearlman & Pearlman, Guide to Rapid Revision) But you have some excellent examples here of the importance of the comma to avoid ambiguity.

Unit III It seems unecessarily complex and possible confusing to make so many fine distinctions about items in a series. Words, phrases, and clauses is enough for most students to know for the purposes of punctuation. It's not as though this is the most troublesome area of comma usage, in the sense of being a major cause of ambiguity. It is merely a convvention of usage, which, in fact, changes if you are writing for British publication.

Unit IV
#29 "Test: If the sentence makes sense without the appositive, it is non-restrictive." It would be helpful to include this advice!

Item: Example Please by Atwell Scruggs (revised edition)

page
pretest-UnitVI
#2 The list of players is misleading. There should be an "and" before Fred's name so that the reader knows this is intended as the last name in the series.

Preface This kind of humor is always more appreciated by teachers than by students.

13 "He could see his name Dr. P. T. Jones..."
↖punctuation missing

all The paragraphs for review at the end of each unit provide one of the best types of test in context.

Since this is a very rule-bound approach where are the rules for when not to use commas (students commonly put punctuation marks where they don't belong).

29 Students will see this rule violated in very short sentences ("I always have and I always will"), or in sentences with

one clause that is very short ("He ate constantly but he still couldn't get enough food to satisfy his cravings."). Why not tell them of this exception?

28, #10 "Either he tries a part-time job, or he drops out of school." This sentence contains compound elements and many texts and authorities would not require a comma here. Numbers 9 and 10 should be omitted and substituted with sentences of the same type as the others.

31, #19 See my comment about the exception to this rule in my notes for 21B's punctuation exercise.

No exceptions are ever acknowledged in this text. Everything is presented as much more black and white than they actually are.

Unit III.
#'s 20, 21, 22, 23
Could do without reference to parts of speech. See comment on same exercises in 21B.

35 Excellent set of exercises

35, #19 typo --comma inserted after "Above" when it should have been left blank for student to fill in.

Unit IV
#'s 25 - 35 Far too much attention given to this simple convention. See my comment on this in 21B.

#36 This is given short shrift. How do they know when adjectives are coordinate? What about "I didn't enjoy the cold, tasteless Chinese American food."? or "He wolfed down his typical American meal."? Students need a test for knowing when adjectives are coordinate. There are two common tests:
1. non-coordinate elements sound crazy when reversed
2. you can't put "and" between non-coordinate elements and still have them sound right

50 This long paragraph for punctuating a series strikes me as very childish and characteristic of how inane some of these exercises get in order to provide a situation for using only a very specialized punctuation mark. Page 26 has another example of a very stilted paragraph. There really is no challenge to the student here. It's apparent that only one form of punctuation is required. I don't see any learning taking place from this kind of busywork.

Exer. 42 Good--they need to learn how to make the discrimination between restrictive and non-restrictive.

all Most of the sentences and paragraphs are not on a very sophisticated level. That is, they are "journalistic" language rather than the kind of language found in college level books. This might be alright, but it wouldn't hurt to include a healthy sampling of more "academic" language, the kind most students will be confronting in their reading and writing.

65, #43 Again, as in 21B's punctuation exercises, students need to know exactly under what circumstances you can join two main clauses with a semi-colon. Why not just tell them, "Use a semi-colon to join independent statements that are closely related." (Random House Handbook)

69, #47 The rule is much more complex than this and difficult for students to apply. Long clauses joined by coordinating conjunctions are also acceptable even if they don't have internal punctuation (Chicago Manual of Style) and short clauses joined by coordinating conjunctions may be punctuated with a semi-colon when they present a sharp contrast or the author wishes to make the second clause more emphatic (Random House)

75, #50 RULE - "(The colon should not interupt a grammatical structure Too vague. Should read, "The colon must be preceded by a complete sentence (main clause)."

77, #51 What about colons in letter-writing and terms of address?

79 The several notes about the interchangeability of colons and dashes are good.

77-79
Exer. 52,53,56
In some instances the author would have the option of using a comma (or even, in some cases, parentheses or colon) instead of a dash. These rules are oversimplified. Students should know what choices are available. (There is an art to punctuation as well as a science. Otherwise, why do publishers go to the trouble of developing their own standards?)

87, #61 Good rule of thumb

91, #66 ditto

Post-tests They test what is taught in each unit, but they seem easier than the reviews because they are sentences, not paragraphs. Post-tests should be longer, more difficult paragraphs. The real test of the entire book would be to have two or three long paragraphs, or even articles, that must be punctuated using several marks in each.

Item: Paragraph Comprehension (21C)

Pre-tests None. Should be unit by unit pre-tests

1 & 2 Most students would benefit from more than one sample exercise

Exer. 1 Excellent choice of selections. Good academic tone at college level, excellent answer choices. Far above quality of contents in other lab work for 21C. It might be possible that some students in 21C would need to start with simpler paragraphs.

Exer. 2 Excellent on all counts as with one, except don't you think

Section 3 should have followed through on the instructions and had more than one topic sentence that wasn't #1 and at least one paragraph without a topic sentence?

23 Why aren't the answers to the sample exercise completed?

Exer. 3 Some of the answers are arbitrary and should indicate the possibilities of more than one correct choice. For instance, p. 25, D2, another correct answer would be #1. Actually the sentence is related to both #6 & #1. This does not seem to be a particularly valuable lesson.

Exer. 4 This is very important practice in the basic logical tools used to develop essays, and most students benefit from some exposure. However, the answers would be more instructive if they gave an explanation of why a particular paragraph is what it is, and acknowledged overlapping methods of developement. (For instance, illustration and detail is used to achieve the cause-effect pattern of F.) Why are students given this material in the book but not tested on it in the post-test?

Post-tests Much easier than the actual exercises, which might be alright depending on what you want to accomplish.

Item: Paragraph Writing Review (1A)

Pre-test none--really needs one

2 Idea of primary and secondary supports is vague. It seems odd to call the concrete details secondary. The relationship is really between concrete and abstract, specific and general and students find these distinctions most helpful. The whole issue is far more complex and interesting than indicated here.

4 No one is going to bother doing these exercises when the answers are so easy to see. The directions here are really poor.

9 The comparison sentence is also cause and effect. Analysis and classification are presented as one category in 21C's Paragraph Comprehension. Actually, all these patterns are analysis of one kind or another, so this is a misleading use of the term.

Exercise Sheet 3

#'s 6 & 7 "f." is also a correct answer for both of these

#'s 8 & 9 Why isn't #9 "f" and # 8 "c"? Either could be justified. The above offer good examples of how these categories can overlap, a fact that should be acknowledged in the Answer Key

3 & 7 These essays are really dull and inappropriate for 1A work. How would they fit into a complete essay?

Post-test As with 21C Paragraph Comp. post-test, there are no questions

on methods of development. Is this an admission that the technique has dubious educational value and students shouldn't be required to know the material because it is so arbitrary?

Item: "English 1A Punctuation Review"

Comments for Example Please covers these materials also.

Item: Essay Comprehension (1A)

Pre-test None. I don't see any reason for good readers to do this work. Pre-tests are definitely in order.

format The layout of both this book and the 21C Paragraph Comp. book could definitely be improved. Visually overcrowded, with no variations in heading and spacing. Hard to read.

Exer. 2 For a comment on this section, see my notes for exer. 4 in 21C Para. Comp.

Exer 3 Good study skills taught here.

44, Line 8 "...drying the dog, less because..."
delete comma to prevent misreading

57,line17 "A Broadway play colled Boeing Boeing was advertised as 'all around me..."

This is the wrong preposition, try "...with this quote from a critic ..."
This sentence is a poor example.

There are no extensive notes on the arbitrary answers to some of the exercises and tests in this book because such comments would represent an exercise in futility. I am fundamentally opposed to presenting such complex material in a format that does not allow for discussion and dialogue.

Item: Research Skills Booklet

Pre-test None. It needs one. What if student has taken a course in research or library skills? I realize that the absence of pre-tests for many of the lab materials reflects a concern for funding should too many bodies be lost, but that's just another argument for expanding the scope of the lab.

Sect. III Incredibly long-winded way to present this information. Works to make it seem more inaccessible that it really is.

Section V One skill that could be taught as a special section before this section is how to select and integrate quotes. Many students don't know how to artfully include quotations to support their points.

TWO TYPICAL WRITING TUTORIALS

THE PRE-WRITING INTERVIEW

Goals	Strategies	Skills Development
1. To determine if student understands the essay topic.	1. Identify key words and the focus of the assignment. If clarification is needed, the instructor should be consulted.	1. Knowing your audience.
2. To test student's comprehension of the reading.	2. Student explains what the reading is about. Tutor questions student's interpretation but does not offer any answers. Instead, resources, such as a guide to literary terms, are introduced to the tutee.	2. Paraphrasing, summarizing, and utilizing resources.
3. To stimulate ideas which may lead to a thesis.	3. Tutor asks a series of open-ended questions designed to relate the topic to the student's own experience. Tutor directs student to jot down ideas.	3. Logical thinking, memory, and note-taking.
4. To produce a tentative outline for the paper.	4. Student arranges notes from the dialogue in logical order. Tutor supplies helpful hints about outlining methods, but also encourages the random flow of ideas on paper. Student has begun writing first draft.	4. Freewriting and outlining.

THE ROUGH DRAFT INTERVIEW

Goals	Strategies	Skills Development
1. To prevent student from turning in a rough draft which the instructor will have to grade as a final draft.	1. Tutor makes a determination: Is this draft a sound base for a finished product, or does it need to be completely rethought and/or extensively revised?	1. Writing as process: Mastering t many steps of composing.
2. To give the student an objective view of what is on the paper and to encourage self-correction.	2. Tutor underlines paragraphs, sentences, or words that need correction. Tutor works from making general suggestions to identifying specific flaws, emphasizing systematic detective work and frequently asking, "What did you mean to say when you wrote this?"	2. Rewriting.
3. To determine how much the student knows about the mechanics of writing.	3. Student reads a faulty passage aloud and either self-corrects or the tutor explains by giving other examples of the same error. Pencil and paper are in student's hands and all corrections are made by the writer. The tutor will explain grammar rules whenever necessary to reinforce student's new awareness of how to shape language.	3. Proofreading, overcoming anxiet building confidence.

Thom Hawkins, copyright 1977. Student Learning Center/University of California-Berkeley

APPENDIX B - continued

Muriel Harris
Department of English
Purdue University
West Lafayette, Indiana 47907

Process and Product:
Dominant Models for Writing Centers
(a summary)

Among the hundreds of writing labs, writing centers, writing places, and writing workshops that exist, it is unlikely that there are any two that are alike in size, structure, format, and range of services offered, and the variety would seem to preclude the possibility of finding underlying models which bring coherence to seeming chaos. However, despite the appearance of endless diversity, there are threads of commonality which link all writing centers. All offer individualized help in some form, and all are tailored to the particular concerns of their own institution. They are responsive to student needs and faculty demands, and because they are responsive, they are flexible, constantly re-forming, changing, and growing, to serve the needs of their college or university and its population. All are dedicated to helping students improve those particular writing skills that each student must have in order to succeed in the regular college classroom, whether the assistance is offered in a highly structured or unstructured format, is a supplementary service or an extension of the classroom, offers credit or is open-ended, or is staffed by professionals, student tutors, or machines. All aim at improving student writing skills, but it is with the type of writing skills being emphasized that such facilities seem to diverge into two major types which--for convenience--will be labeled here as writing labs and writing centers.

In the writing lab the focus is on helping the student write more correct finished products, papers with a reasonably high degree of correctness in spelling, sentence structure, usage, punctuation, and so on. To help students master these conventions of grammar and mechanics, such labs need to provide extensive practice, and the teaching tools many include self-instruction books, cassette tapes, computer-assisted instruction, and probably a fair number of home grown exercise sheets and modules. Often, such labs provide course credit or are integrated into remedial courses in some way and are used on a regular weekly basis. Working primarily with machines or printed self-instruction materials, students can work at their own pace, can come at whatever hours they find convenient, and can spend some or most of their lab time working on their own to master discreet units of information. The feedback on their work is immediate, they are not penalized for failures, and unlike the classrooms where they have usually experienced continuous failures, they progress through a series of successfully completed units.

Such labs can be and often are very successful. With carefully prepared materials appropriately used, they offer the hours and hours of practice and immediate feedback that non-traditional students require before entering the mainstream of the university. A potential source of difficulty in such labs, however, is the very wealth of machinery which pleases administrators by its efficiency, cost-effectiveness, and consistency. Amidst all

that hardware, students can get lost in the shuffle, de-humanized. In a place ostensibly attuned to helping them, students experiencing difficulty with writing may find it hard to retain their interest or motivation, though the skills they are there to master are easily recognizeable once attained. Evaluation of the lab's services is a relatively manageable task in that frequency of errors can be counted and compared before and after students' lab work.

Unlike the machine-centered lab which focuses on the product the writer produces, the writing center directs its attention toward helping the student as he or she writes, that is, with the process of writing. In a tutorial or small group setting, the student and tutor are more likely to talk about a paper in progress, in the planning stage, or about to be revised. The discussion tends to deal with matters of organization, topic development, clarity, and other rhetorical skills that are not easily taught through self-instruction materials because of the need for a reader to respond to the student's writing. Such a writing center is expensive to operate in that there are more paid teacher-contact hours, though course credit for undergraduate tutors can be a useful and inexpensive alternative. Moreover, there is a constant need to train tutors, and it is more difficult to maintain consistent quality or to evaluate the work of such a lab as its benefits may, and usually do, include the less tangible improvements in motivation, attitude, and understanding of the writing process. Though usually not included in the figures collected on the number of people served, the tutors in writing centers are also learning how to improve their own writing skills. Equally difficult to document is the student preference for working with tutors rather than machines, a preference which tends to cause many labs to de-emphasize their hardware and become writing centers. For the non-traditional student in need of a familiar focal point in a strange world, the writing center also provides a home-on-campus. Finally, another resource of the writing center is its staff's ability to reach out across the campus and into the community, to offer workshops, seminars, and other services.

As research in the process of writing moves forward, and as new insights are gained through the research of Emig, Pianko, Perl, and others, writing centers attuned to teaching the process of writing will have a far greater role to play in working with the composing process, on a one-to-one basis, with both remedial and traditional students. Moreover, as collaborative learning becomes more solidly entrenched in the academic setting, writing centers may also become a model for other kinds of learning facilities within the university. And, should the "writing across the curriculum" movement become a standard concern, the ability to serve the broader writing interests of the university community ensures the writing center a prosperous future. But, budget constraints, falling enrollments, and the probable increase in the number of non-traditional students will create an equal need for the efficient services of writing labs as well. However, it is more probable that with the present healthy disdain for dichotomies and a continued interest in serving students in any way that looks useful, most writing labs, workshops, and centers will probably opt to pick and choose the best from each model to suit their own circumstances, just as they do now. The real threat to their existence is not whether they make a wrong choice in the emphasis of their instruction, but whether they become rigidly locked into a particular format which does not allow for change.

THE GROWTH OF WRITING CENTERS

General Description

We propose that this Jossey-Bass Sourcebook should contain approximately ten chapters by invited authors and two by the editors, and brief, pithy quotes that will serve to fill the white space between chapters as well as to function as a forum for dissent on the merits of writing centers. The book will emphasize issues over mechanics, although most articles will contain much useful and practical information about the operation of writing centers. Authors will be asked to assiduously avoid parochialism by balancing descriptions of their own units with wide-ranging coverage of units at other institutions. Readers should be able to come away from this volume having a better sense of what the whole field of writing centers is accomplishing in the schools, and which types of writing centers seem to be the most effective. It should make clear that the future of writing centers lies in service to all college students, not only those in need of remedial help, because the individualized services and supportive environment of writing centers are central to learning how to write. At the same time, however, the continued growth of writing centers is linked directly to the urgent need of colleges to effectively reach a new wave of non-traditional students during the coming era of declining enrollments.

Today's writing centers were not conceived in the most orderly and well-planned fashion. It has been a messy beginning, and there have been casualties. Although we currently sport a healthy appearance, some would question our future. In the scramble for dollars, space, and respect, the survivors have too seldom had the opportunity to look inward and seek direction at a level beyond the fiscal. Such scholarly introspection and analysis holds the promise of substantial reward. In this volume, we, the editors, hope that experienced practioners and talented researchers will do serious battle with the issues that affect not only the survival of writing centers, but the quality of writing instruction and, ultimately, the ability of future college graduates to use written English with grace and precision.

Phyllis Brooks and Thom Hawkins
Guest Editors

THE GROWTH OF WRITING CENTERS

Edited by
Thom Hawkins and Phyllis Brooks

Proposed Table of Contents

Chapter I.

A Comparative Analysis of Predominant Models for Writing Centers

An overview of the current state of the art which makes the point that there is controversy in the field between a machine-oriented "lab approach" and centers which stress one-to-one contact with tutors. Without passing judgement, the article should review the pros and cons, failures and successes, of each major approach, and speculate on future trends.

Chapter II.

The Politics of Innovation

Reports on the professional issues surrounding the continued growth of writing centers, including such problems as interaction with established faculty, objections from the unions, and professional growth of writing center staff/faculty. Assesses the impact of writing centers on the job market for English teachers.

Chapter III.

Starting Small and Thinking Big

An administrator's viewpoint of the fiscal evolution of writing centers and their impact on campus-wide policy-making and planning. Examines successful fund-raising strategies, both internal and external. Projects growth patterns for the eighties.

Chapter IV.

A Rationale for Writing Centers

Taking a historical perspective, this article examines precursors to writing centers in a variety of educational settings. Makes the point that there are sound educational reasons for the existence of writing centers, and that their growth belongs to a long tradition of concern for individualized learning, and not merely a reactionary response to political and economic pressures.

Chapter V.

The Writing Process and Writing Centers

Synthesizes current research on how students learn to write and applies that knowledge to a systematic and coherent philosophy for the instructional role of writing centers. Relates theory to practice and describes the long range impact of the writing center movement on the teaching of writing at all levels of college instruction and on the literacy of future graduates.

Chapter VI.

Training Writing Center Staff

Compares and evaluates a variety of training programs for faculty, peer tutors, volunteers, and media assistants. Acknowledges that there may be more than one effective way to train, depending on institutional perogatives, but attempts to identify the most preferred, if utopian, training scheme in terms of tutors' own perceptions of their needs.

Chapter VII

The Media Mess: Computers, Video-tape, Projectors, and Pencils
Aids practitioners in selecting appropriate media based on goals and philosophy. Presents an update on computers and their potential for teaching grammar and revision, on video-tape for tutor training and self-paced instruction, and ranks some exemplary (good & bad) commercial programs. Provides guidelines for budgeting, purchasing, and long-range planning; suggests strategies for integrating media with other, people-based services.

Chapter VIII

The Basic Writer: Lab or Tutor?
Addresses the question, "Should grammar, vocabulary, and editing skills be taught segmentally in isolation from contexts larger than the sentence, or should they be taught in tandem with the rhetorical and logical skills necessary to produce connected discourse?" Two authors will present opposing views of the writing center's role in remediation.

Chapter IX

Bi-lingual Students in the Writing Center
Since most writing centers serve a large proportion of bi-lingual students, this article will provide practical guidelines for training staff to instruct these students and for selecting appropriate materials. Will review the most promising methods for dealing with the expected influx of bi-lingual minorities in the eighties.

Chapter X

The Scope of Writing Centers
Describes how writing centers have gone beyond being merely service depots or remediation and now attract diverse users from all segments of the campus population, including students from business and science courses who want help with report writing, faculty seeking feedback on journal articles, and creative writers who are trying to make room for expressive writing in the expository jungle of adacemic prose. Recommends approaches to equitable instruction for all groups, while still maintaining the writing center as a place where non-traditional students can find the support they need while they are being assimilated into the campus environment. Suggests the potential for the writing center as a nexus of campus-wide activity, with adjunct programs tailored to individual departments ("writing across the curriculum) and public events.

Chapter XI

Developing a Sense of Audience Through Peer Tutoring
Writing centers provide students with ample contact with a representative of their intended audience in the form of peer tutors. Using materials written by tutors in their journals, this chapter examines the way tutors use dialogue to help students learn to control their written language.

Chapter XII

Evaluating The Writing Centers: Does Tutoring Make a Difference?
Looks at the difficulties inherent in evaluating the results achieved by writing centers, especially the problems in evaluating tutoring. Cites representative studies, and presents several case studies of students who have been tutored. Makes recommendations for further studies and suggests designs for evaluation in the eighties.

Fillers: In the spaces between chapters there will be selected quotes from students, faculty, and public figures. They will present both positive and negative view of the writing center. These fillers should act as a forum for dissent.

Standards for Basic Skills Writing Programs

The recent issue of COLLEGE ENGLISH includes a report entitles "Standards for Basic Skills Writing Programs." The document, prepared by an NCTE task force chaired by Gary Tate of Texas Christian University, is in response to a request from the United States office of Education.

The report includes an "Operation Definition of Writing" and detailed characteristics of the teaching-learning, support, and evaluation components of a basic writing program. Listed as characteristics of teaching and learning were the following items:

TEACHING AND LEARNING

1. There is evidence that knowledge of current theory and research in writing has been sought and applied in developing in writing program.

2. Writing instruction is a substantial and clearly identified part of an integrated English language arts curriculum.

3. Writing is called for in other subject matters across the curriculum.

4. The subject matter of writing has its richest source in the students' personal, social, and academic interests and experiences.

5. Students write in many forms (e.g. essays, notes, summaries, poems, letters, stories, reports, scripts, journals).

6. Students write for a variety of audiences (e.g. self, classmates, the community, the teacher) to learn that approaches vary as audiences vary.

7. Students write for a wide range of purposes (e.g. to inform, to persuade, to express the self, to explore, to clarify thinking)

8. Class time is devoted to all aspects of the writing process: generating ideas, drafting, revising, and editing.

9. All students receive instruction in both (a) developing and expressing ideas, and (b) using the conventions of edited American English.

10. Control of the conventions of edited American English (supporting skills such as spelling, handwriting, punctuation, and grammatical usage) is developed primarily during the writing process and secondarily through related exercises.

11. Students receive constructive responses - from the teacher and from others - at various stages in the writing process.

12. Evaluation of an individual writing growth:
    (a) is based on complete pieces of writing;
    (b) reflects informed judgements, first, about clarity and content and then about conventions of spelling, mechanics, and usage;
    (c) includes regular responses to individual pieces of student writing as well as periodic assessment measuring growth over period of time.

Discussions of these and other items contained in the document would certainly be within the purview of NARDSPE members who teach basic writing.

THE GROWTH OF WRITING CENTERS

Biographical Sketches of Guest Editors

Thom Hawkins

M.A. in Education (Reading & Language Development) from the University of California at Berkeley, 1977. Established and has coordinated the Writing Center (part of the Student Learning Center) at Berkeley since 1978. Initiated and has directed the tutor training course in writing since 1973, and has also trained ESL, Language, and Social Science tutors from 1973 to 1976. Taught remedial composition part-time and summers in the Subject A department at Berkeley from 1972 through 1978. Author of a book on teaching remedial reading to adults, a monograph on teaching college composition, several articles in professional journals, numerou papers delivered at national and regional teacher conferences, and four grant proposals that received funding. Designated a Summer Fellow in the Bay Area Writing Project, University of California, Berkeley, 1977. Has taught a variety of short courses in writing and reading, from beginning to advanced levels, and has conducted training workshops for staff and faculty.

Phyllis Brooks

Holds degrees in both Romance languages (French & Italian) and Near Eastern Languages (Turkish & Arabic). Has been a university instructor of French, associate editor of an international journal (Isis), technical editorial adviser to the Turkish Ministry of Education, teacher of English as a second language, journalist (newspapers & radio), and a freelance editor and translator. Since 1970 a lecturer in the Subject A department at Berkeley, and for several years the chairman of the department, she has always been interested in the contribution that tutoring and learning centers can make to the instructional programs of colleges and universities. Founded the tutoring program in the Subject A department, which eventually became the tutoring program in the Student Learning Center. Has recently been developing a long-standing interest in the teaching of technical writing, and is now also a Lecturer in Mechanical Engineering at Berkeley. In 1979 worked on a special faculty grant project with the Writing Center's tutors and produced a complete library of grammatical guides and exercises for students. Has written journal articles on the teaching of writing, including, "Mimesis: Grammar and The Echoing Voice," which has been anthologized by the National Council of Teachers of English

The remaining pages of Appendix B contain copywrited materials and have therefore been deleted.

These pages contained:

1. "Interview with Frank Christ" by Nancy G. Spann, Journal of Developmental and Remedial Education, Volume 3 No. 1 (Fall 1979) pp. 8-11.

2. "Training and Using Peer Tutors" by Paula Beck, Thom Hawkins, and Marcia Silver, College English, Volume 40, No. 4 (December 1978) pp. 432-436.

3. "Peer Tutoring at a Community College" by Paula Beck, College English, Volume 40, No. 4 (December 1978) pp. 437-439.

4. "Training Peer Tutors in the Art of Teaching" by Thom Hawkins, College English, Volume 40, No. 4 (December 1978) pp. 440-449.

5. Exchange A Newsletter for Teachers of Writing, Volume 4 No. 2. Published by the Writing Lab, University of Wisconsin - Stevens Point.

6. Excerpt from "One-to-One: Tutorial Instruction in Freshman Composition" by Roger H. Garrison, New Directions for Community Colleges, Volume II, No. 1, Spring 1974.